

264. By Mr. PATTERSON: Petition to make available a fund to be loaned to the farmers of Tallapoosa County, Ala., in a similar way as the drought loan of 1931; to the Committee on Agriculture.

265. By Mr. SNOW: Petition of Rev. J. O. Bouchard and many others of St. Francis, Me., favoring a duty on pulpwood and firewood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

266. Also, petition of Rev. Albert Charette and many others of Grand Isle, Me., favoring a duty on pulpwood and firewood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

267. Also, petition of F. D. Fournier, of St. David, Me., and many others favoring a duty on pulpwood and firewood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

268. Also, petition of Fred Pelletier and many others of St. John Plantation, Me., favoring a duty on pulpwood and firewood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

269. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition of the American Legion of the Department of California on naval-reserve aviation; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

270. Also, petition of the American Legion of the Department of California on the Army Air Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1932

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most loving Father who givest to us all the spirit of grace and of supplication, we beseech Thee for Thy compassion's sake to sanctify this day our thoughts, our words, and our actions, that they may be attuned to Thy most holy purpose. In olden days the wise men guided by a star made earnest quest to find their king and, lo, they found a babe. So lead us now by the star of love to life's most sacred shrine where we may find the Christ Child cradled in each human and yield to Him our royal gifts, that pain and suffering, privation and poverty, woe and want, fear and despair may be relieved through Thy ministry in us. Grant this for His sake, who said "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren you have done it unto me." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. FESS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hattigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to pay Anna Jarvis a sum equal to six months' compensation of the late Grant Jarvis.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|
| Ashurst | Copeland | Harrison | McKellar |
| Austin | Costigan | Hastings | McNary |
| Bailey | Couzens | Hatfield | Metcalf |
| Barbour | Cutting | Hawes | Morrison |
| Barkley | Dale | Hayden | Moses |
| Bingham | Davis | Hebert | Neely |
| Black | Dickinson | Howell | Norbeck |
| Blaine | Dill | Hull | Norris |
| Borah | Fess | Johnson | Nye |
| Bratton | Fletcher | Jones | Patterson |
| Brookhart | Frazier | Kean | Robinson, Ark. |
| Bulkeley | George | Kendrick | Robinson, Ind. |
| Bulow | Glass | Keyes | Sheppard |
| Byrnes | Glenn | King | Shipstead |
| Capper | Goldsborough | La Follette | Shortridge |
| Caraway | Gore | Lewis | Smith |
| Connally | Hale | Logan | Smoot |
| Coolidge | Harris | McGill | Steiwer |

| | | | |
|---------------|------------|--------------|---------|
| Thomas, Idaho | Tydings | Walsh, Mass. | Wheeler |
| Thomas, Okla. | Vandenberg | Walsh, Mont. | White |
| Townsend | Wagner | Waterman | |
| Trammell | Walcott | Watson | |

Mr. BLACK. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. KENDRICK. My colleague the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] is necessarily detained on official business. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day as to roll calls.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

LAWLESSNESS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General transmitting, in compliance with Senate Resolution 116 (agreed to December 21, 1931) and pursuant to the direction of the President of the United States, certain reports of experts of the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement prepared under the direction of Judge William S. Kenyon, etc., which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPENDIX TO COST-ASCERTAINMENT REPORT, POSTAL SERVICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the appendix to the cost-ascertainment report of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1931, submitted by the Postmaster General in connection with the cost-ascertainment report heretofore transmitted by him, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from Hamilton & Hamilton, attorneys, of Washington, D. C., transmitting, in compliance with law, the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1931, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Norman Baker, of Muscatine, Iowa, praying for an investigation of the Federal Radio Commission, with reference to the operation of radio station KTNT and the matter of free speech and censorship, especially in connection with the subject of a cancer cure, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BARBOUR presented resolutions adopted by members of the Rutherford (N. J.) Rotary Club, favoring the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kyle, Tex., praying that steps be taken against war and in behalf of disarmament, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Minnesota, praying for the passage of legislation known as the farmers' farm relief act, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Menahga, Minn., praying for the reduction of taxation and governmental expenditures, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COPELAND presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., remonstrating against the submission of the question of repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the various States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC-BUILDINGS PROGRAM

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have had communications from my State asking about the condition of the public-buildings program of the Government. I do not see the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] in his seat, but perhaps some other Senator can answer me.

As I understand it, we have approved projects for the construction of a great many public buildings, and in various reports which have been made from the White House attention has been called to the activity of the administration in the relief of unemployment by the erection of these buildings. To my surprise, however, I find that certain buildings which were approved in my State, notably the public building at Buffalo, apparently have been abandoned. I should like to inquire, for the benefit of citizens of my State, what is the attitude of the administration regarding going forward with these projects. I do not know whether any Senator but the senior Senator from Utah, who seems to be the spokesman of the White House in these matters, can speak, but if anyone else can answer I should like to have the information.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] is chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. COPELAND. He does not seem to be in the Chamber at the moment.

Mr. President, this is the situation. We made appropriations for certain public buildings. There were other approved projects, and the Congress had every right to believe last year that we were going forward with those projects. The argument was made at the time that by erecting these buildings there would be relief of unemployment in many localities. But apparently the White House in its effort to have a paper improvement in conditions has decided not to go forward with these buildings. I think every Senator is interested. There must be some project in each State of the Union which is an approved project. Certainly the Senate should be advised as to whether it is the intention of the administration to abandon these projects.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. KING. Of course I do not speak for the White House nor for any branch of the Federal Government, but I think it is only fair and just to say that the Treasury Department, in my opinion, has been going forward with considerable expedition in the matter of public buildings. I have had occasion to come in contact with Mr. Heath and his associates, the representatives of the Post Office Department, and I know they have been very earnest in their efforts to push to completion the various projects which have been undertaken.

I have had occasion to complain because the department would not employ local architects, but they have insisted in most instances that the architectural force of the department is adequate to the demands of the Government and that where they had permitted local architects to prepare plans and supervise the erection of buildings delays have been occasioned far greater than any delay which would have resulted if the Government had carried out its plans itself. I can not speak, of course, for Buffalo, but I think in the main the department has acted with reasonable diligence.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Utah that he has been so fortunate. I can not say that I have had the same experience; and it certainly is significant that the defense of the administration has to come from the Democratic side. I should like to hear from the other side of the aisle, which is now in control of legislation, and to ascertain what is the attitude of the administration toward these approved projects and why they have not been included in the Budget which has been sent to us. I notice the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] is on his feet.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will suggest that this debate is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. BORAH. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho objects. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BAILEY. I present a telegram from the Governor of the State of North Carolina relative to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill. I ask that it may lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram]

RALEIGH, N. C., January 4, 1932.

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,

The United States Senate:

In my opinion, based upon the gravity of the present situation, the most important measure pending before Congress is the act creating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The immediate passage of this measure will do more to restore the confidence of the country in the banking structure than any other bill before Congress, for the reason that it will create the psychological effect that the power and resources of the Federal Government are behind the banking structure of America. I believe it most important to have a provision in this act authorizing the corporation to make advances against the assets of closed banks, both State and National, in order to liberate funds now tied up in these closed banks.

O. MAX GARDNER.

RESTRICTION OF TAXATION

Mr. BAILEY. I also present a resolution of the North Carolina Bankers Association, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Finance and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH CAROLINA BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Raleigh, December 31, 1931.

HON. J. W. BAILEY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: The following resolution has been adopted by the executive committee of the North Carolina Bankers Association and is sent to you under their instructions:

"Realizing that governmental expenditures in the Nation, States, counties, and municipalities have increased manifold during the past few years and that the result has been an ever-increasing burden on the taxpayers of every kind, which is now reflected in the distress of all manner of people and business; and
"Realizing further that the time has come for a drastic reduction in public expenditures with the consequent reduction in all forms of taxation, and that the national authorities should immediately lead the way in effecting such reductions: Now therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States should immediately pursue every reasonable course leading to a reduction in all forms of public expenditures and to a strict limitation, in so far as possible, in all forms of taxation to the end that individuals and corporations of all classes may have an opportunity of rehabilitating their affairs without the strangling effects of further increased forms of taxation."

It is urged by the officers of our association and the members of its executive committee that you use such efforts as you consider advisable in order that the recommendations contained in this resolution be given careful consideration by Congress.

Yours very truly,

PAUL P. BROWN, Secretary.

PROPOSED RESUBMISSION OF THE EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT

Mr. TRAMMELL. I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary a resolution adopted by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Miami, Fla.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at a largely attended meeting of the Miami Woman's Christian Temperance Union at the White Temple, Monday, December 14, 1931, and we are sending a copy to each of our Members of Congress:

"Whereas it is reported that the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment will be voted on at this session of Congress; and

"Whereas those asking for resubmission have not advocated any definite plan for the control of the liquor traffic, asking only for the repeal of the existing laws; and

"Whereas prohibition was adopted after all other methods had been tried and failed; and

"Whereas under our present financial crisis we need all our energies to work out a plan for the return of prosperity, we feel it is a very poor time for Congress to advocate a resubmission of the question that would arouse intense antagonism among the people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we call upon our representatives in Congress to do their moral and patriotic duty by voting against the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment at this time."

Very respectfully yours,

Mrs. LENORA H. HOLCOMB,
President Miami Woman's Christian Temperance Union.
THE PALMS, 242 NORTHEAST THIRD STREET,
Miami, Fla., December 15, 1931.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BROOKHART. I have here a letter from the chairman of the committee on Federal legislation of the American Bankers Association with reference to an amendment suggested by Mr. Traylor to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill, and also two telegrams from Iowa bankers upon the same subject, which I desire to have inserted in the RECORD and to lie on the table.

There being no objection, the letter and telegrams were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., January 5, 1932.

HON. SMITH W. BROOKHART,
Member Banking and Currency Committee,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BROOKHART: With reference to Senate bill No. 1, for the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation now coming before your committee, I desire to urge on behalf of the American Bankers Association the necessity for immediate passage of the bill, and also that it be amended to include the suggestion made by Mr. Traylor at the hearings a few days ago to permit loans on the assets of closed banks.

The members of our association feel that such loans would substitute cash for slow assets, unlock frozen deposits in closed banks, and by placing them back in the hands of the public assist in their reopening and materially aid business recovery.

I trust that the committee will give serious consideration to this suggestion of Mr. Traylor and urge that it be incorporated in the bill.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT V. FLEMING,
Chairman Committee on Federal Legislation.

OSKALOOSA, IOWA, January 5, 1932.

Senator SMITH W. BROOKHART,
Washington, D. C.:

Having a copy of the bill favoring reconstruction finance corporation act, also the Traylor amendment to the act, we are wiring you asking that you support the Traylor amendment for the relief of frozen assets in banks. We believe this should be given prompt action by the United States Congress, as we feel it would be a great relief to the present condition of times.

B. E. EVANS,

Auditor.

E. R. RAFFETY,

Mahaska County Treasurer.

W. L. CAMPELL,

M. C. MONTGOMERY,

C. W. ANDERSON,

Board of Supervisors Mahaska County, Iowa.

OSKALOOSA, IOWA, January 5, 1932.

Senator SMITH W. BROOKHART,
Washington, D. C.:

Having a copy of the bill favoring the reconstruction finance corporation act, also the Traylor amendment to the act, I am wiring you asking you to support the Traylor amendment for the relief of frozen assets in banks. I believe this should be given prompt action by the United States Congress, as I feel it would be a great relief to the present condition of times.

C. ED BEMAN,

Vice President Mahaska County State Bank.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. BORAH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the following nominations, which were placed on the Executive Calendar:

Emil Sauer, of Texas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a consul, to be a consul general of the United States of America;

W. Roderick Dorsey, of Maryland, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a consul, to be a consul general of the United States of America; and

Stephen E. Aguirre, of Texas, and Overton G. Ellis, jr., of Washington, to be Foreign Service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

Mr. BORAH also, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the following conventions, which were placed on the Executive Calendar:

Executive E (71st Cong., 3d sess.), international convention relating to the treatment of prisoners of war, signed at Geneva July 27, 1929; and

Executive F (71st Cong., 3d sess.), international convention for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and sick of armies in the field, signed at Geneva July 27, 1929.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. BORAH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 287. An act to compensate Harriet C. Holaday (Rept. No. 29);

S. 440. An act for the relief of Lillian G. Frost (Rept. No. 30);

S. 631. An act for the relief of Alice M. A. Damm (Rept. No. 31); and

S. 1338. An act for the relief of Germaine M. Finley (Rept. No. 32).

Mr. NYE, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (S. 475) to provide for the establishment of the Everglades National Park in the State of Florida, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 34) thereon.

SURVEY OF INDIAN CONDITIONS

Mr. FRAZIER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, submitted a partial report (No. 25, pt. 2), pursuant to Senate Resolutions 79 and 308, Seventieth Congress, and Senate Resolutions 263 and 416, Seventy-first Congress, relative to the affairs of the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT CLERK TO THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 24) submitted by Mr. FESS on the 9th ultimo, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Library of the Senate is hereby authorized to employ a special assistant clerk during the Seventy-second Congress, to be paid at the rate of \$2,220 per annum out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

MEMBERSHIP OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—EXPENSES

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the same committee, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 61), submitted by Mr. WALSH of Montana on the 10th ultimo, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, authorized by Senate Resolution No. 415, agreed to February 5, 1931, to engage counsel for the purpose of instituting proceedings to secure a determination of the right of George Otis Smith to the position of member of the Federal Power Commission, hereby is authorized, in the prosecution of such litigation, to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate \$5,000 in addition to the counsel fees heretofore authorized.

MARJORIE RUTH RANKIN AND ALICE JOSEPHINE RANKIN

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the same committee, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 108), submitted by Mr. BROOKHART on the 18th ultimo, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1931, to Marjorie Ruth Rankin and Alice Josephine Rankin, widow and daughter, respectively, of Roy H. Rankin, late the clerk in the office of Hon. SMITH W. BROOKHART, a Senator from the State of Iowa, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be divided equally between said widow and daughter, and to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the same committee, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 109),

submitted by Mr. HATFIELD on the 18th ultimo, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Immigration, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventy-second Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the same committee, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 121), submitted by Mr. CAPPER on the 22d ultimo, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventy-second Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA—CONTEST

Mr. TOWNSEND. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report Senate Resolution 60, with an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 60) submitted by Mr. SHORTRIDGE on December 10, 1931, was read as follows:

Whereas on the 3d day of March, 1931, the Senate referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections the pending contest between George M. Pritchard and Josiah W. Bailey involving the question whether the said George M. Pritchard or the said Josiah W. Bailey, or either of them, is entitled to membership in the United States Senate as a Senator from the State of North Carolina: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections is hereby authorized to hear and determine said contest and to take such evidence as it may deem proper in order to determine the questions involved and certify its conclusions to the Senate.

Said committee is authorized, by itself or by any subcommittee, to investigate the questions aforesaid, and shall have authority to act by or through such agents or representatives as it may see fit to designate.

Said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to issue subpoenas and require the production of all papers, books, documents, or other evidence pertinent to said investigation, and to impound ballot boxes and all records and paraphernalia used in the election in question, and said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions of the Senate and during any recess of the Senate or of the Congress, and to hold its sessions at such places as it may deem proper.

It shall have authority to employ clerks and other necessary assistance and to employ stenographers at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per 100 words, and to cause to be taken and recorded all evidence received by the committee, and to have said evidence printed for the information of the Senate.

The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and his deputies and assistants are hereby required to attend the said Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, and to execute its directions.

The chairman of the committee and each and every member thereof is hereby empowered to administer oaths and generally have such powers and perform such duties as are necessary or incident to the exercise of the powers and duties imposed by this resolution.

Said committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

The cost of investigations and proceedings in pursuance of the foregoing to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate and not to exceed \$25,000.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Let that resolution go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go to the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HEBERT:

A bill (S. 2678) amending the statutes of the United States to provide for copyright registration of designs; and

A bill (S. 2679) to protect trade-marks used in commerce, to authorize the registration of such trade-marks, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

A bill (S. 2680) for the relief of Harry E. Blomgren; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2681) for the relief of John C. Harker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 2682) to amend section 5 of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 2683) making applicable to certain persons the benefits of the emergency officers' retirement act of May 24, 1928; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 2684) for the relief of F. P. Case; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2685) to convey by a quitclaim deed from the United States of America to the County of McIntosh in the first congressional district of the State of Georgia a certain island known as Black Beard; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 2686) for the relief of the American Trust Co. of Jacksonville, Fla.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 2687) to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LOGAN:

A bill (S. 2688) for the relief of the Shelby County Trust & Banking Co., of Shelbyville, Ky.;

A bill (S. 2689) for the relief of the Union Bank & Trust Co., of Lexington, Ky.; and

A bill (S. 2690) for the relief of the State Bank & Trust Co., of Richmond, Ky.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 2691) granting a pension to David Fatty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 2692) granting a pension to Noah C. Dugan; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2693) for the relief of George Parker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COUZENS:

A bill (S. 2694) for the relief of the Union Guardian Trust Co., successors to Union Trust Co., of Detroit, Mich.; and

A bill (S. 2695) for the relief of the Detroit & Security Trust Co., successors to Security Trust Co., of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 2696) to authorize the issuance of unrestricted patents to certain public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 2697) for the relief of Clarence G. Young;

A bill (S. 2698) for the relief of Herman Ingman; and

A bill (S. 2699) for the relief of Joseph L. Rudd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 2700) granting a pension to William W. Lee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 2701) for the relief of John B. Crowell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 2702) granting compensation to the widow and minor children of Francis C. Oxley; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2703) for the relief of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2704) for the relief of Henry W. Goedecke;

A bill (S. 2705) authorizing the Secretary of War to award the congressional medal of honor to Joseph A. Minturn;

A bill (S. 2706) for the relief of Allen A. North; and

A bill (S. 2707) for the relief of James Tulley Hazel (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2708) granting an increase of pension to Edith Ross;

A bill (S. 2709) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Samson;

A bill (S. 2710) granting an increase of pension to Fanny Cunningham;

A bill (S. 2711) granting an increase of pension to Anna O. Kirkpatrick (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2712) granting a pension to Mary Bothwell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2713) granting a pension to Samuel Porter Conway (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2714) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Miller (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2715) granting an increase of pension to Elzena Troxell (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2716) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the pensions of certain maimed veterans who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in the same, in line of duty, in the military or naval service of the United States; and to amend section 4788 of the Revised Statutes of the United States by increasing the rates therein for artificial limbs," approved February 11, 1927 (U. S. C., sup. 1, title 38, sec. 168a); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GLENN:

A bill (S. 2717) granting a pension to Walter R. Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2718) to authorize the erection of a 532-bed addition to the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at North Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BULKLEY:

A bill (S. 2719) for the relief of the City Savings Bank & Trust Co., of Alliance, Ohio;

A bill (S. 2720) for the relief of the Union Trust Co., successors to the Broadway Savings & Trust Co., of Cleveland, Ohio;

A bill (S. 2721) for the relief of the Central United National Bank, successors to United Banking & Trust Co., of Cleveland, Ohio;

A bill (S. 2722) for the relief of the Union Trust Co., successors to State Banking & Trust Co., of Cleveland, Ohio; and

A bill (S. 2723) for the relief of the Central United National Bank, successors to United Banking & Trust Co., of Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 2724) for the relief of Thomas Green (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2725) granting a pension to Cranford C. Wilson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FESS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 75) authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure an oil portrait of former President Calvin Coolidge; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) to authorize a flood-control investigation by the American section, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, in cooperation with the Mexican section, and authorizing the construction of flood-control works; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. GEORGE. I introduce a joint resolution and ask unanimous consent to make a very brief statement regarding it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator making a statement? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Georgia will proceed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, numerous bills have been introduced proposing reductions in Federal salaries and suggesting other economies. If we are to do more than pay mere lip service to economy at this session of the Congress, it seems to me to be necessary to confer upon the President of the United States blanket authority to consolidate offices and bureaus within the executive department, independent branches of the executive department, and, where the public service will not be adversely affected thereby, to abolish outright boards, commissions, and various executive services both in the executive department and in the so-called independent executive branches. I therefore introduce a joint resolution having for its purpose that particular end.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) authorizing the President to reorganize the executive agencies of the Government was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McNARY. At the request of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE], who is necessarily absent on account of illness, I offer an amendment to House bill 6660.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Appropriations Committee.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. ODDIE to House bill 6660, the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1932, was, at the proper place in the bill, to insert the following:

Indian agency building: For construction of a power-transmission line and distribution system, including equipment and necessary rights of way, Walker River Agency, Nev., fiscal years 1932 and 1933, \$17,000.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced the bill (S. 2675) providing for an emergency circulation fund, and for other purposes. It was referred to the Committee on Finance. I think that was an improper reference. I ask unanimous consent that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, several days ago I introduced a bill (S. 2475) to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which committee in the House the same bill had been referred.

My attention has been called to the fact that previously a bill to provide for the establishment of an airport in the city of Washington was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I agree that that is the proper committee to which this bill should be referred. I understand from the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, who is now present, that he has no objection to the course of procedure which I am about to suggest. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds may be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it may be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

THE RUSSIAN PROBLEM

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered on October 25, 1931, by Albert Ottinger, former attorney general of the State of New York, on the Russian problem.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In a speech delivered by President Coolidge on February 22, 1929, he said, "We have no important unadjusted problem with the government of any European nation with the exception of Russia." Russia has indeed been a problem since the date of the revolution, October 7, 1917, when the Soviet Government came into existence.

It is difficult to convey a proper concept of Russia to those who have not had the opportunity to visit that vast country. People are not to be criticized for having been misled by misrepresentation of propaganda either for or against the existing government. I had the opportunity to go to Russia to make my own observations. Among other places I visited Moscow, Leningrad, sailed

down the Volga, stopping off at the various cities on the journey; I motored across the Georgian pass to Tiflis in the Republic of Georgia; I went to the Crimea and down to the Black Sea. My trip, taken with 94 other Americans, covered 6,000 miles in European Russia and included cities, oil fields, farming districts, coal mines, steel mills, winter and summer resorts.

Obviously it was impossible, within a short space of time, to take in the entire Russian country, which in extent of area is more than three times the size of the United States of America. Topographically it is very similar to America, and this is also true of the Russian climate. One passes through vast stretches and can imagine oneself in North Dakota, Wyoming, or Arizona, in the Great Plains countries. There is, therefore, a natural affinity existing between Russians and the Americans. One great difference is that America has found her freedom in a stabilized government, while Russia is struggling for the attainment of her ideal. It is a simple thing to criticize, but it is far more just to consider the facts. It must be remembered that Russia was a nation of serfs, who were released from bondage in 1861, since which time and up to the date of the revolution they were the subjects of an absolute monarchy. And whatever may be said against conditions as they exist to-day, the almost universal expression in Russia is that they are far better for the masses of the people than under the reign of the Czar.

Revolutions must run their course. Similar transitions took place in France, which is a much smaller country than Russia. The pendulum swung one way all the way over toward imperialistic Russia to the other extreme which occurred immediately after the revolution in 1917. In between these two metamorphoses there was the opportunity presented to Kerensky, whose government was not sufficiently stable to last more than seven months. Had that government been successful, many of our present problems might not have arisen. Under the régime of Lenin, who is regarded as the great man of the revolution, the pendulum was gradually swinging back to a point where theoretical Russia was ready to meet the practical needs of the day. This was made evident by the fact that when President Coolidge, in his first message to Congress in 1923, expressed his "desire to see that great people who are our traditional friends restored to their position among the nations of the earth," provided Russia would recognize the sanctity of her international obligations, the Soviet Government offered to discuss all matters in dispute on the "principle of mutual nonintervention in international affairs." The proposed conference, however, never took place. A misunderstanding between the two countries then became inevitable.

While in Russia I had occasion to address various organizations; to tell them that while America respects the struggling efforts of a people to find their freedom it maintained that the United States of America should have its institutions and its cherished traditions respected and upheld by all other countries. I repeated the same thought to certain officials in Russia, who assured me they were ready to meet such demands and to negotiate for settlement of any other contention which America might make.

Russia is ruled by a one-party government, being controlled by what is known as the Communist Party. The communists consist of 1,500,000 people governing a nation with a population of about 150,000,000. The word "communist" should not be misunderstood to mean anarchist or nihilist. In fact, I found the Russians a peace-loving people who believe that war or violence would be destructive of their carefully prepared program of development. In order to become a communist in Russia it is necessary to pass an educational and a physical test, in addition to being qualified from the standpoint of character and loyalty to the existing government. The applicant must first be approved by the local party, and after he has passed his examination he must receive the sanction of the National Party. When once admitted to the Communist Party the communist must devote himself to his country's needs. He must go where sent. He must do what the Government exacts. He must not criticize publicly the existing government, but is called upon to reserve such criticism in private conclave. He must not act frivolously or do things which bring disrepute upon the communistic institutions. If he does these things, he is apt to be expelled from the party. Obviously, the communist would be the first to admit that Russia to-day is not a free country, but he will also tell you that he is working toward the accomplishment of its ultimate freedom; further that it never has been free. He feels that the Russian mass needs guidance until it has attained its education and its objective.

Very few officeholders are elected directly by the people. Those who are are either mayors of cities or delegates to the national convention. Many of the mayors of cities are women, and women have played an important part in the national government and in the diplomatic service. There is a selective method of voting for delegates to the national convention, whereby people in various professions vote for representatives in the same profession. For instance, a bricklayer will vote for a bricklayer, a professor for a professor, a lawyer for a lawyer. The national convention chooses the cabinet which controls the policies of the Russian Government. At present the outstanding figure in the control of Russian affairs is Stalin, who, though not a member of the cabinet, is the secretary of the Communist Party. Every appointee has the right to demand once a year that his superior officeholder give himself an annual housecleaning or, rather, render an account of his stewardship. It is customary that even when this demand is not made the official will make the report on all of his actions voluntarily.

Political prisoners are dealt with more severely than criminals. Political graft is punishable by death. Integrity in office is the watchword of all Russians, and the honor of serving as a government official is considered more important than the salary compensation. The highest official receives but 225 rubles a month, or about \$115. Of course, if he is a cabinet member he may be permitted the use of a home and an automobile so long as he acts in that capacity. The salaries of all government employees are fixed by the government according to the grade of work which they do. When I say "government employees," I include all workmen who are employed in business which is owned and operated by the government. On the other hand, Russia has made many concessions to private capital. These concessions depend upon the terms contained in the individual contract. So far as these contractors are concerned, the salaries of their employees are fixed by them and not by the government. It is possible to get much greater concessions for the construction of certain quasi public undertakings in Russia than can be obtained in many States in America. The idea back of these private contracts is that they will ultimately help to achieve the fulfillment of the program of the Russian Government for the development of Russia.

The Russians are most desirous of obtaining skilled American workmen and instilling American methods and mechanical organizations in their country. So you will find the General Electric Co., the Westinghouse Co., the Ford Manufacturing Plant, and other vast enterprises which have material interests in great organizations in Russia. The Russians are developing great water power and electrical plants. These were inaugurated in the régime of Lenin. Germany has taken greater advantage of its opportunities of trade relations with Russia than any other country. Russia has organized what it calls its 5-year plan for the development of essentials, consisting of the building of railroads, electrical plants, the development of its mines and oil fields. The favored group in Russia consists of the industrial workers, because the government feels that they make the greatest contribution to the upbuilding of the country. While Russia is very sympathetic with its farm or peasant problem, it has adopted a policy of fixing prices for farm products so that they can be purchased by the industrial interests for their maintenance.

While the State in Russia owns all property, it permits the peasant to live upon his farm tax free, as far as land taxes are concerned, so long as he desires to do so. The middleman, or "kulak," who is the village money lender to the farmer, is taxed more heavily than any other class.

These distinctions in classes are carried out even in the prisons, some of which I visited, where the sentence inflicted for the commission of a criminal offense is determined largely by the nature of the work the offender was engaged in before the commission of the crime. In other words, a laborer receives a lighter sentence than a peasant, a peasant is preferred to a kulak, and the monarchist receives the heaviest sentence. All prisoners are put to work in order to make them useful citizens after their freedom. In Moscow all prisoners are given a two months' vacation. Almost without exception they return to the prison after the expiration of the vacation term.

The ruble is the money standard of Russia. Within Russia it is kept upon a parity of 2 to 1 to the dollar. This parity must be maintained in order to work out the economic problems of Russia. Bootlegging in Russia consists of the bootlegging of Russian rubles. This is accomplished by means of discovering some one who will sell his goods at a ratio of five or six rubles to the American dollar. This miscreant is able to obtain his exchange in foreign countries. Therefore Russia will not permit any foreigner to bring rubles into her country or to take them with him when he departs.

Russia has a passion for the education of her children. It is literally true that many of the children of the revolutionary period have grown to manhood and womanhood splendidly educated. All over Russia one sees centers of art and culture which are devoted to the development and the education of the young. Dyetskoye Selo (the Czar's summer residence) is completely turned over to children. In the Crimea the palaces of the Czars and the mansions of the rich are devoted either to the children or to neurasthenic and consumptive patients.

In the Crimea, which is one of the most beautiful places in the world, I was very much inspired by the medical treatment administered to the children who suffer from tubercular bone diseases, which are more prevalent in Russia than infantile paralysis. I visited that hospital, which is established at a great altitude in that magnificent country. There the children were being educated in bed. They were bright and cheerful. On that day they expected the visit of the Minister of Medicine. When he came to them with one accord they cried for more industrial schools, schools in which under their impaired condition they would be able to develop their careers. Their prayers were answered and the assurance of more schools was given by the minister. The children who had sufficiently recovered entertained us with a very interesting play. Those who were still unable to rise from their beds gave us a concert, and they played their instruments while lying on their backs. The beauty and the inspiration of that moment remains with me.

When one greets a workman in Russia he is called comrade or citizen, the idea of equality being constantly impressed upon everyone. I have had more tips refused in Russia than in any other country in the world. I do not mean to say that everybody

refuses to receive a fee for menial service, but I do say that nowhere else have I found present the disposition to do work as a citizen for a stated salary and not one cent more.

The Russian communists call themselves agnostic. Really I believe that they have given themselves over to a species of Lenin worship, because wherever one goes one sees photographs of Lenin in the home, statues of Lenin in the streets, and the dead body of Lenin is preserved in the public square in Moscow for the inspiration and the gaze of the passer-by. It is almost like the story of Buddha and Buddhism. But in spite of the protestations of the communists, there is deep religious fervor, especially among the older people; and so far as the Asiatic religions are concerned, one sees when approaching a Tartar country that they are kept pretty well intact. The Jews reserve their Jewish centers unmolested by the Government.

In spite of everything that has been said there is no such thing as religious persecution in Russia, and no man is discriminated against or arrested because of his religious belief. There are comparatively few churches that have been destroyed and very few that have been taken over for governmental purposes. The Russian Government does not encourage religious teaching but would prefer to see religion practiced in the home. I regard this as synonymous with the French Revolution, and, of course, I believe that religious conditions will improve materially as time goes on. Due to the fact that the tyrant Czar was the head of the church and that under him pogroms and massacres occurred frequently, the Russian mind has become confused and religion has been made the victim of the Czar's misgovernment. But no such massacres and pogroms exist to-day. I believe that it is quite possible to arouse a better sympathetic understanding among religious creeds by means of friendly negotiation rather than by demonstrations of bitter hatred.

Music and the arts have been maintained upon a high plane. The Russian is by nature emotionally artistic. The Russian dance or ballet has attained an eminence and significance not reached by any other country. Russian museums are cherished and preserved. In Leningrad we find 72 Rembrandts and many of the other great old masters; in Moscow there is one of the best exhibitions of modern art to be seen anywhere. The palace of Catherine II is at least as beautiful as the palace at Versailles, although the palace of Nicholas II is mediocre in the extreme. Wherever we went on our Russian trip the citizens were eager to have us listen to their music and see their artists perform.

The Russians are most likeable people and generous to the last ruble. They are warm-hearted and sympathetic. They are particularly fond of America and Americans. They welcome trade relations and the opportunity for a better knowledge of America. As a matter of fact, though we are dealing with them at arm's length, our exports to Russia in 1930 amounted to over \$100,000,000 as against imports to our country of \$30,000,000.

If I am asked whether I believe that the Russian Government can succeed, I shall answer that its success depends upon the practical statesmanship of those at the head of their Government and the respect which they will have for the maintenance of the institutions of other nations. I do not believe that pure Marxism can succeed, but I do believe that it is necessary for the Russian statesman to find the compromise between the theoretical and the practical. Right here let me quote Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH:

"No one would rejoice more than myself to see the Government of Russia changed in many essential particulars. I entertain no doubt it will be changed, though probably not speedily. But who could wish for its overthrow and for an attempt to restore in some form the old régime and to reestablish old conditions? Are we interested in seeing the brutal system which for 300 years exploited and oppressed the people of Russia again riveted upon the Russian people?"

"But it is useless to speculate on whether we would like to see these things done, for they can not be done. An attempt to bring about old conditions would inaugurate an era of misery and bloodshed, of suffering, and decimation which no tongue could portray and no language could paint."

"These people are endeavoring to put behind them for all time their everlasting peonage and degradation. They are traveling through fire in devious paths and over bloody roads. But they are striving to be an independent and powerful people. These people want freedom. They want security against old oppression. They may not see clearly but they are reaching for better things and a better life. In the words of Edmund Burke, 'The poorest being that crawls on earth contending to save itself from injustice and oppression is an object respectable in the eyes of God and man.'"

"The younger Pitt, in dealing with the French Revolution, saw only Robespierre, Danton, and Barère and other leaders, and shaped his policy toward the French Revolution in accordance with his conception of these men. Washington saw the whole people of France, believed in them, even in the bloodiest hours of the revolution believed in them, and shaped a policy far different and far wiser. Leaders are here for a day. The people are here for all time. It is the people who will determine finally the policy of Russia and her place in the politics of the world. I prefer to keep in mind the Russian people, in whose ultimate success socially, economically, and politically I have unbounded confidence."

I have attempted to discuss Russia dispassionately. I am a conservative, and therefore can not appreciate all of the radical doctrines inaugurated in Russia. But I can not fail to be inspired by the sacrifices which 150,000,000 people have brought for the last 13 years upon an altar of an ideal for universal brotherhood, whether or not they succeed. As an American I am concerned only if they dare to attempt to undermine our institutions. But as an American, realizing that there were but 48,770 people who voted the Communist ticket in the United States in the presidential election of 1928, I do not fear for the future of my country or whatever sporadic attempts might be made by individuals to undermine it. The Russian Government maintains that it is not responsible for propaganda circulated by the Third Internationale. That will have to be proven to our satisfaction. But while that is so, we should not permit ourselves to be misled by propaganda which is inaugurated by those who desire to see the existing government fall. Those of us who have lived through the Great War, those who have suffered in the fight for humanity, are yet listening with patient ear to the truth-telling historian who now has the courage to separate facts from fiction. We are learning what false propaganda meant in the past. We are determined that our conclusions in the future shall be based upon facts and evidence.

In 1923 Russia held out the olive branch, ready at least to discuss the contentions which caused our severed relations. In 1923 that great opportunity which spells the future development of Russia was offered to America as her favorite among the nations. Perhaps we should have listened even though the negotiations might have failed. Perhaps we would have been given the opportunity to say, as was said in the Good Book: "Come, let us reason together." Perhaps at least in our eyes Russia would have yielded to the essentials of modern civilization and of the demands of free America.

Mr. Valery I. Meshlauk, vice chairman of the supreme economic council of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republic, said recently in his speech to the American Russian Chamber of Commerce, " . . . in the last fiscal year Soviet grain exports amounted to less than a third of the pre-war volume. It is my belief that matters of ruinous international competition in wheat and other products could be solved by means of international agreements in which the Soviet Union would willingly join. The Union of Socialist Soviet Republics by virtue of its vast natural resources, is in a position to produce most efficiently a number of materials which the rest of the world requires. It would seem that the best manner of solving the problem of production and distribution on a world-wide scale is by an international division of labor."

Says Senator BORAH: "In my opinion, the greatest potential, the greatest developing market in the world for American goods, is in Russia. This market is ours under any reasonable policy. Our conditions, our great unemployed, ought to encourage us to seek foreign markets wherever they may be found."

Mr. Thomas D. Campbell, the great wheat grower of Montana, is quoted as saying:

"I have just returned from an investigation of agricultural and economic conditions in several European countries, and I find that the biggest market in the world to-day for American goods is in Russia. There is enough business there to relieve our industrial depression almost immediately."

Mr. Ralph Budd, president of the Great Northern Railway, is reported by Senator BORAH to have said that "nearly \$3,000,000,000 worth of equipment will be necessary for the modernization program if the 5-year plan is to be realized."

Undoubtedly much false propaganda is inspired by royalists who want to see the present government fall. Senator BORAH is also of the opinion that its origin is commercial when certain particular interests have not been able to secure concessions from the Russian Government. In this connection it is instructive to hear what he has to say about the alleged dumping of wheat into the United States:

"A few days ago I secured from the Department of Commerce some figures with reference to imports from Russia. Let us take, first, wheat. In 1929 Russia exported into the United States 12 bushels of wheat, worth \$17. In 1930 she exported no wheat whatever. Yet I venture to say that millions of farmers in the United States last summer were led to believe that large importations of wheat were coming into the United States. I read a public address by a man in public office who said 'What is the tariff worth to the American farmer upon wheat when the Russian is laying down wheat in New York City for 38 cents?' There has been no wheat laid down in New York from Russia."

From all of the above it is obvious that it would be quite possible to enter into a favorable trade treaty mutually beneficial to both the United States and Russia—one which would protect us against ruinous competition and would at the same time magnify the importance of our export trade.

Mr. Paul D. Cravath, the great international lawyer, has said that if he were Secretary of State he would "take the first opportunity for getting round a table and talking over our mutual difficulties and claims and trying to see if there were not some basis of agreement." He would not "go too far in demanding concessions in advance," and believed that the matter of the settlement of debts and confiscated property was "by no means impossible of solution."

The courageous attitude of President Herbert Hoover in continuing trade relations with Russia in spite of false testimony

and forged documents is typical of the human understanding of the Hoover who fed them during the war.

In an article in the *Herald Tribune* written on July 25, 1930, Calvin Coolidge said: "We have held the opinion that trade and time would be the means of restoring Russia. * * * Our people are so thoroughly attached to their own systems of self-government that we need not feel it is in imminent danger."

Naturally, the question uppermost in the minds of people who consider the Russian problem is whether Russia shall be recognized by the United States. This question was being seriously considered by President Coolidge in 1923 and upon terms mutually protective and satisfactory to both countries. Since that time and very recently, Mr. Stalin has stated that he sees no reason why capitalism and the Russian form of government can not live happily together on a basis of real cooperation. The Russian Government has further modified its Marxian theory by establishing a rule that the highest wage shall be paid to the laborer who does the most work, and that salaries should be graded according to that test. The bourgeoisie, quite ostracized two years ago, is now regarded much more favorably by the government.

Indeed, Colonel Cooper has said, "In my opinion it is more proper to designate the present soviet industrial system as state capitalism rather than communism."

It is my thought that the best way to develop capitalism is to make a people prosperous. If you sow the seed of hatred; if you deliberately keep a country poverty stricken and hungry, then you will encourage terrorism and anarchy. If you give a boy a bicycle, he becomes a capitalist. If you make a nation prosperous, its people become capitalists, and Marxism will be destroyed, or greatly modified.

America has the opportunity to uplift the world and benefit itself through the development of Russia. Conversely, if Russia is left to its own devices and fails, it may undermine the rest of humanity. America can develop the 5-year plan for Russia and supply the essential materials. This would mean a tremendous new market for the United States. If Russia is properly developed, such development can easily result in an annual sale of goods to Russia of \$3,000,000,000 by the outside world.

What Russia needs to-day is credit, in order to raise the standards of living. World prices are declining because of a lack of a buyers' market. A credit extended to Russia in this country for the purchase of materials here by Russia would immediately stimulate our market and inaugurate a new era of prosperity for the United States. With the loss of so much of our foreign trade, here is our opportunity to regain it from a new source. We must find new fields for economic activity in order to restore confidence and prosperity.

The resumption of diplomatic relations and the immediate recognition of Russia under mutually protective trade treaties should be accomplished as soon as possible. Such a treaty should also guarantee the payment of past debts; it should give assurance that our Government and our institutions will be respected and upheld by the Russian Government. Such prompt action would at once lift us up out of the slough of despond, quicken our industrial activity, and insure prosperity for future generations.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. WALCOTT. Mr. President, I report with an amendment, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill (S. 1) to provide emergency financing facilities for banks and other financial institutions, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 33) thereon.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to suggest to the Senate a few considerations that I think justify the contention that this bill should take its regular course.

The subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency reported to the full committee yesterday afternoon at 3 o'clock. The subcommittee had closed its hearings, as I understand, on the 22d day of December last. The full committee yesterday afternoon devoted two and a half hours to the consideration of a number of amendments. When the full committee met, it was announced by the chairman of the subcommittee that printed copies of the bill as recommended by the subcommittee would be furnished very shortly, in fact, within 15 minutes. Then, later on, it was suggested that the printed copies of the bill recommended by the subcommittee would be furnished to the committee within five minutes. When the committee adjourned at about 5.30 o'clock yesterday afternoon the committee had not received copies of the printed bill as recommended by the subcommittee. If I am mistaken in my recitation of these details, I will be glad to have the chairman of the subcommittee correct me.

The amendments, therefore, which were proposed by the subcommittee were acted upon without the members of the

committee having any opportunity to give any consideration to those amendments or to study them except during the brief moments before the statement of the chairman that if there was no objection the amendment would be accepted or before the motion was put that the amendment be adopted.

Therefore, the whole committee had little opportunity to give any study to a bill, of which there are 20 pages of text in addition to the matter stricken out, making 35 pages to be considered, involving the expenditure of \$2,000,000,000 out of the Public Treasury; a bill, as I study it, designed primarily for two purposes. One purpose is to come to the aid of the very banking institutions that were to a large extent responsible for our present condition. The other provision of the bill clearly is designed for the purpose of producing an upward trend in the stock market. Those are the two objects that are particularly emphasized in this bill; at least, those are the two results that will flow from this bill when it shall have been passed. It seems to me that a bill of such importance ought not to be rushed through the Senate of the United States.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that identically the same conditions existed in 1929 which led up to the crash in the stock market as exist to-day; substantially the same economic conditions existed following the stock crash in 1929. The Congress thereafter was in session. It adjourned on March 4, 1931. The same conditions that we have to-day existed on March 4, 1931, and continue to exist down to this very moment. Notwithstanding those facts, the President of the United States stubbornly and wilfully declined to call the Congress into session.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is unfair to the taxpayers of this country and it is unfair to the people of the country as a whole to rush through here on a moment's notice a bill in which there is not one single mouthful of food for the hungry or one single working day for the unemployed workman. So, Mr. President, in view of the circumstances, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin objects. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. WALCOTT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will withhold his objection for a moment, as I wish to make a brief statement?

Mr. BLAINE. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Connecticut making a statement? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Connecticut will proceed.

Mr. WALCOTT. Mr. President, without attempting in any way to contradict the Senator from Wisconsin, the facts are these: The hearings were concluded on Tuesday just prior to the Christmas recess. The subcommittee was exceedingly anxious to hold the Senate in session until the bill could be brought to a vote. That seemed to be impossible. However, most of the members of the subcommittee spent the holidays in obtaining additional information with reference to the emergency that exists and which has been getting more acute day by day, until the demand for the relief contemplated by this bill is tremendous and country-wide. We earnestly endeavored to conclude our subcommittee work yesterday morning. That was impossible, however, on account of two or three controversial points; but our work was concluded by 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and at that time the full committee listened to the report of the subcommittee.

The full committee, as the Senator says, spent about two and a half hours in the consideration of the measure. There was not enough time intervening between the deliberations of the subcommittee and the meeting of the full committee for printing the bill, but it was typewritten; and late during the meeting of the full committee these typewritten copies were furnished. The bill was printed early this morning, with the report, and is on each Senator's desk.

My only plea is this: The country needs the revenues provided in this bill. The organizations quickly will begin to function after the passage of the bill, and the demand for its passage is so great that I wish the Senator from

Wisconsin would withdraw his objection. If he will not, of course, the best we can do is to let it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WALCOTT. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wonder whether it might not be possible to proceed with the debate on this measure? Probably the debate would bring out information as to its character and its objects as well as quiet reading in our offices.

Would not the Senator from Wisconsin be willing to have the bill considered and discussed, with the understanding that no vote will be taken to-day, necessarily, but that we might consume a good deal of time in the discussion of the bill so as to inform Senators about its character? It seems to me we might save some time in that way.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, it is very obvious that it will be impossible to discuss this bill properly at to-day's session, since the Members are not familiar with its provisions, and I doubt whether many of them have had an opportunity even to make a pretense of becoming familiar with its provisions. It is clearly obvious that debate of the kind proposed by the Senator from Kentucky would be futile, and therefore perhaps result in confusing and confounding the situation rather than in throwing light on just what the measure means.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator objects.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me add that the amendments adopted by the committee do not change the fundamental character of the bill. The hearings are on our desks. They have been available for some days. The bill has been printed. It seems to me we might profitably spend some time to-day in discussing the measure.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, may I take the liberty of reminding the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that in committee, at least, this bill was gone over item by item, almost sentence by sentence. Full opportunity was given to each member of the committee—and there was an unusually large attendance of members—to offer suggestions and to propose amendments to its various provisions. Suggestions were made, and amendments were presented and adopted or rejected, as the judgment of the committee dictated; and, in my view, so far as the committee is concerned, no dispatch of procedure could possibly obtain by delaying action here.

I am rather disposed to concur in the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] that we might save time by following the course he suggests. We have been persistently and constantly assured that time is the essence of the whole thing. We will not save any time by deferring discussion.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, of course if there is a measure before the Senate that is the regular order of business, if any Member who favors this bill desires to present his views he will be at perfect liberty to do so. The testimony, however, has just been printed and come to the desks of Members, and the bill itself has just been printed and come to the desks of Members. Unless Senators who are not on the committee have followed this matter very closely, and obtained transcripts of the testimony, and knew what the subcommittee was doing and what the full committee was doing, I doubt if any Member opposed to the bill is ready to enter upon its debate. Clearly, they could not undertake a very intelligent debate unless the conditions which I have stated obtained.

So, if any Member desires to debate this bill—any Member who favors it, or, for that matter, any Member who opposes it—he is at perfect liberty to debate it when we take up the consideration of some other regular order.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia has stated that this bill has been gone over very carefully, line for line. I have no doubt as to the truth of that statement; and yet it is rather peculiar that in the second section of the bill this committee is not only acting on a banking proposition but is acting as an appropriations committee,

and actually appropriates \$500,000,000 instead of authorizing the appropriation of that amount.

Mr. GLASS. I may say to the Senator that that was done with great deliberation and after considerable discussion. It was the intention of the committee, upon the urgent recommendation of the Treasury Department, to make the appropriation and not simply to authorize it in order to expedite matters.

Mr. JONES. I am glad to have that information.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield I desire to make another suggestion.

In a subsequent section of the bill the Senator will find that there is an appropriation of an unlimited amount out of the Public Treasury—a sum mounting into figures which no one at the present time can anticipate. That is another appropriation made by the bill—not only a half billion dollars but on top of that a sum sufficient to pay for all the losses and all of the “dead horses” that this financial corporation is going to find on its hands.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. Will the Senator refer to the paragraph which he interprets in any such manner as that?

Mr. BLAINE. Yes; the paragraph appropriating a sum sufficient to take care of any losses that may be incurred. That exactly illustrates the situation we are in. I have followed this bill very closely, yet I have not had the time to analyze it section by section, and I am unable at this time to give the Senator the specific information, but I assure him that he will find in the latter part of the bill that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to do as I have stated.

I now call the Senator's attention to the page. On page 26, beginning with line 18, the bill provides:

The said obligations—

That is, the obligations of this reconstruction finance corporation—

shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed both as to interest and principal by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. In the event that the corporation shall be unable to pay upon demand, when due, the principal or of interest on reconstruction bonds, or other obligations issued by it, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the amount thereof, which is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator appears, however, to overlook the fact that there is a limitation of \$2,000,000,000; and the Senator previously made the statement that there was an unlimited appropriation from the Treasury. That is not accurate.

Mr. BLAINE. I do not know about that.

Mr. COUZENS. I mean here is a limitation.

Mr. BLAINE. I may be mistaken.

Mr. COUZENS. I think the Senator is. I did not want the statement to go to the country that there was no limit to the appropriation that may be made from the Public Treasury. The limit of the obligation of the Federal Treasury is the amount of securities, and interest thereon, that may not be paid by the corporation itself.

Mr. BLAINE. Since the Senator has called my attention to that situation, I agree with him; the limitation would be \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BLAINE. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator will recall that the bill provides for a capital of \$500,000,000, which is provided here, and then it gives power to issue as much as three times the capital in debentures in the operation of this corporation; so that the absolute limit is three times the capital. They can not issue obligations exceeding that amount under any circumstances; so that would be the limit of that appropriation in any case, if all of it were lost.

Mr. BLAINE. And taking the two appropriations—the half billion and the billion and a half—the maximum is two billion, as suggested by the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. There is a guaranty by the Government of these debentures to the amount of one billion five hundred million. Of course, in all probability, there will be no such amount ever issued. The power is given here to issue that amount and, besides, all of it will be upon adequate security; so that probably the Government would, or undoubtedly ought to, get all of it back.

There is just one point I should like to suggest to the Senator, and that is, time is of the essence of this measure. If we are to do any good, we must do it now. If it is well to do it at all, it is well to do it quickly; and I was going to suggest that the Senator might allow the bill to be read now and save that much time. In other words, we are here this morning, and we could at least save some time by going on with the measure.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, comment has been made by various Members that time is of the very essence of this situation. In my opening remarks I called attention to the fact that the condition of bank failures now prevailing has been going on for some time. Why, in 1930 there were 1,345 bank failures in this country—the largest number by far that had ever failed in any prior year in the history of our country—and yet, in the face of the failure of 1,345 banks in America, as I said, the President willfully and stubbornly declined to call Congress into session, and then announced to the country the creation of the National Credit Corporation, with a half billion dollars' capital, and stated that that was going to come to the rescue of these failing banks.

Now it is urged that time is of the essence of this matter. Why, we have had plenty of time, a surplus of time. No; it is not a question of time at all. It is a question of the urge of the administration to endeavor to correct the failure of the administration in proceeding too late to save the situation.

So, Mr. President, we have had time enough in which to consider measures of this character. We have had months and months during which bank failures have been going on, and yet the administration has declined and refused to call into session the instrument of government by which and through which something might be done; and now the wail goes up that we must drive this measure through immediately. The necessities, the emergencies, are no greater to-day than they have been for the last two years.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. BLAINE. I do.

Mr. WAGNER. I was about to suggest to the Senator that the fact that the administration has been drifting aimlessly during these serious times, during the past two or three years, is no reason why we should join in that drifting policy. Is not this an opportunity for the Senate to arrest the drifting and take some action?

Mr. BLAINE. I would concede that the Senator was correct in that if the Senate had before it a measure which was going to give a morsel of food to the hungry, or a day's job to the unemployed. But here is a measure—I do not like to repeat, but I do for emphasis—which would not give a single mouthful of food to a single hungry person, would not give a single day of employment to the millions of unemployed. What it does is to come to the support of about 500 banking institutions in this country which own 99 per cent of the banking assets of the country, to the support of those who have exploited the public through the stock exchanges in the inflation of stocks and bonds. It is for their relief, and not for the relief of those who are entitled to the relief.

I do not understand why we should be in such great haste to pay a tribute of \$2,000,000,000 to the very institutions and the very men who have to a large extent brought on the present depression under which we are suffering.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. May I suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that if this corporation should avert the failure of any great industry to meet its obligations and thereby enable it to continue its activities; if it should avert the impending failure of banks and thereby protect the interests of the depositors in those banks, would not the Senator concede that that would be giving somebody employment, and that that would be putting bread into the mouths of the employees of those industries and the depositors of the savings banks and other banks?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, my conception of the bill, I am quite certain, is not the same conception of the bill as that held by the Senator from Virginia. The payment of \$2,000,000,000 is a terrible price to pay for the benefit of the various institutions which have been to a large extent directly and indirectly responsible for the catastrophes which have afflicted this country the last several years.

Mr. President, I for one want to know what institution is going to receive the beneficence of this Government. I want to know under what conditions that institution is to receive it. I want to know whether or not that institution has been a part of the system which has brought America to her knees financially and economically.

For the reasons I have stated, Mr. President, I do not conceive this bill to be in the interest of the American people. In my opinion, humble as it is, out of this bill, it seems to me, if it is to be carried out according to the text, according to the language, we are going to face another situation more desperate than that we face to-day.

The bill proposes to take the choice securities of our Nation, of our institutions, and have them taken over by this corporation. What are those institutions going to do when they part with the only valuable asset they have? Their crash is bound to come. No one needs to be an oracle or a prophet to see far enough into the future to predict that that will be exactly what will occur if this bill shall become a law.

Moreover, Mr. President, the bill is far beyond what I conceive to be the duty and obligation of the Congress. Who are the suffering in America to-day? Are the bankers? Are the select group of bankers? I think about 1 per cent of the total number of bankers control 99 per cent of the banking assets of this country. Is it the stock brokers? Is it the investment houses?

Mr. President, the people in America to-day who are feeling distress are found back upon the farms and in the industrial centers—the men and women who have lost their life savings—and every time you heap an additional burden like this upon the Government you are heaping additional obligations upon those people by way of taxation. Taxation not for constructive purposes; taxation not to feed the hungry; taxation not to give employment.

That is all this bill amounts to. There is not a single provision in it, excepting the one urged by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS], which would afford a single constructive object. That portion of the bill, however, is not designed to be a part of the bill when the bill finally passes the Congress.

Mr. COUZENS. It will be.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I wish to make just one suggestion in connection with the bill just reported. For a long time there has been a controversy between the Senate and the House over the origination of appropriation bills. The House has contended that it has the exclusive right to originate appropriation bills. I do not believe the Senate has conceded that right, but we have followed the custom of allowing the House to originate appropriation bills.

I do not think that question ought to be raised in connection with this bill. It will be raised, however, if the bill just reported shall be passed as it has been reported to the Senate. It does not authorize an appropriation of \$500,000,000. As it passed the House the bill authorizes the appropriation but does not appropriate the money; but the bill now before us would actually appropriate \$500,000,000.

I have no question but that the bill was framed in that way in the interest of saving time; but, in my judgment, if we pass it in that form there will be a controversy between

the Senate and the House over that proposition, which will entail much more time than would be saved by passing the bill in the form in which it has been reported.

I merely make this suggestion so that Members of the Senate may consider it before the bill comes before us for final action. I doubt the wisdom of making the actual appropriation in this bill.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I want to call the Senator's attention to another provision. I think the bill also appropriates, for the payment of the debentures or bonds which are to be issued, fifteen hundred million dollars more.

Mr. JONES. That may be; I have not had an opportunity to go carefully through the bill.

Mr. BROOKHART. I think that money is appropriated by the terms of the bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desire to discuss another matter, if the discussion of the bill just reported has been concluded.

Mr. WATSON. I wonder whether the Senator would not permit the bill to be read to-day?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, objection has been made to the consideration of the bill just reported. Why do we not proceed according to the rules of the Senate? All this debate is out of order. An objection was made to begin with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go to the calendar.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the bill just passed over, and ask to have it printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I would like to have the first bill on the calendar announced, and then I shall ask recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to the fact that in the consideration of the calendar, under Rule VIII, debate is limited to five minutes.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not want to interfere with the program of the Senator from Nebraska. I understand he wants to bring up his "lame duck" constitutional amendment; and if that may be laid before the Senate, I will proceed.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, that will be reached in regular order. I do not know whether there will be any objection to the first two entries on the calendar or not.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. NORRIS. If objection is made to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 14, I shall move that it be taken up.

Mr. HARRISON. I shall wait until we get down to that order of business, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The calendar is in order.

The first business on the calendar was the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) establishing a joint congressional committee to make a general investigation and study of railroad problems.

Mr. COPELAND. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will go over.

The bill (S. 7) to provide for the deportation of certain alien seamen, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The next business on the calendar was the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 14) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed beyond five minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS AND EXPENDITURES

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, in one of the Washington weekly papers of October, 1800, a news item appeared to the effect that the Federal Government had just moved that day from Philadelphia to Washington, and that the force of employees consisted of 54 persons; that all documents and papers were brought in five small boxes and seven large boxes. So it seems to me that at this particular time it might be appropriate for us to take an accounting of growing cost in Government expenditures and visualize the future.

Since that date our population has increased to twenty-three times what it was then. We have now 10 major departments of the Government, 134 subsidiary bureaus, and 35 independent establishments in the Government service.

In 1900 the expenditures of the Government amounted to \$650,000,000. That does not seem so long ago; yet in the short time since then we have increased annual expenditures until they now amount to something over \$4,000,000,000.

In 1900 the per capita tax imposed upon American citizens was \$9.25. To-day it costs every American citizen \$40 to run the Federal Government.

In the last few years there has not been a single department of the Government which has not enormously increased its expenditures. I remember when I first came to Congress, not many years ago, we appropriated for the Army \$100,000,000 and for the Navy one hundred and fifty-odd million dollars. Now, the appropriation bills carry approximately \$400,000,000 a year for those items.

A few years ago a disarmament conference was held here in Washington, when we thought we took steps restricting the building of battleships. That conference was called for the purpose of effecting some savings to the people. Yet we find that naval appropriations have continued to climb. We read with some amazement and some surprise only the other day the news that a bill had been introduced in the other branch of the Congress calling for about \$600,000,000 in naval expenditures for one year.

Mr. President, I shall put into the Record at the close of my remarks a table showing the expenditures in the various departments of the Government as they have climbed through a period of years, in order that there might be unfolded a true picture, not only to the Congress but to the American people, of how we have gone wild in the matter of Government expenditures.

I shall also place in the Record a statement showing the increase in the number of civil-service employees in the various departments of the Government, and showing how enormous has been that increase even in the last few years. As an illustration, let us take the Post Office Department. In 1913 there were 276,000 civil-service employees in that department. In 1922 there were 282,000. To-day in the Post Office Department there are 316,000 civil-service employees. In the Department of Commerce there has been an amazing increase. In 1913 there were 8,788 employees and now there are 23,680. As I said, I shall place the table in the Record showing these increases over the several years in detail. [See exhibits.]

Notwithstanding this enormous increase in the number of employees in the Government service, there has been an amazing increase in expenditures brought about for construction work upon the part of the Government. So when I say that the figures show the total number of civil-service employees in 1913 as 420,000 and the number to-day as 616,837, it does not by several hundred thousand give the full number engaged outside of civil service. We all recognize the terrible situation confronting the country. We know that great fortunes have been wiped out in the last two years. We know that no one to-day can recognize any value in land prices or in stocks, and it is true almost as much as to bonds. We know there are 7,000,000 or more

men out of employment in the country, that industries have been shut down, that farm lands are being sold for taxes, and farm products are worthless, that banks have closed, others are strained, and that is why we are trying to pass the Reconstruction Finance Corporation measure at this time.

The American people, in my humble opinion, are more aroused to-day over extravagance and waste and large expenditures in Government operations than at any time before in the history of the country. One can not pick up a paper from any part of the country but what he will read of the organization of some "tax-reform league," or similar organization calling for a reduction in taxes upon the part of municipalities, counties, and States. I have here papers which tell about these uprisings throughout the country. One, for instance, is from Philadelphia, in the home State of my esteemed friend the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], telling about how 10,000 people were battering at the doors of the city council in order to force them either not to increase taxes or to reduce taxes. The headline says, "Eight groups protest increased taxes in mass meeting."

In the Philadelphia Public Ledger the headline reads: "Threats to wipe out council cheered by huge throngs," and again, "Council bows to will of people and votes to continue 1931 tax rate." In my own State, only the other day, the taxpayers, who have been pretty silent for a long time, held meetings of similar import.

I have been a part of the Congress which has granted these constant increases in Government expenditures. I accept my responsibility the same as other Senators and Members of the House of Representatives. I have never been very much of a restrictionist in the matter of making Government appropriations, but I see the situation as it is confronting us to-day. We are faced with a new condition. The country is suffering. Not only must a diagnosis be immediately made, but a remedy prescribed. Readjustment must be hastened in business as well as in Government operations. These mass meetings are being held everywhere. Petitions are coming to us daily from farmers all over the country, telling us of the action of mass meetings that demand a separation of some of the useless appendages of the Government.

Here is a letter received the other day from a gentleman, telling me of the distressed situation in far away California. He said the taxes had become so numerous in character and so heavy in amount that he was forced to abandon further attempt to hold the property. It was in one of the richest and most fertile valleys in the far West. It was ideally located. It had been most valuable. He had paid an enormous price for it, but he could not meet the ravenous demands of the tax collector, and so he reconciled himself to the real situation and let it go.

Here are the different kind of taxes that he cites which were imposed upon that particular piece of land—State taxes, county taxes, irrigation-district taxes, drainage-district taxes, high-school taxes, special taxes to retire high-school bonds, special school tax, special kindergarten tax, cemetery tax, road district No. 1 tax, road district No. 2 tax, special assessment for eradication of Russian thistle, special assessment for eradication of ground squirrels and other pests. He tells me that the valuation put upon the land by the State and county authorities was \$19,000 and the total tax sought to be collected was \$4,300.

How can the American people hope to loosen themselves from a tax strangle hold like that? Are we going to draw the noose tighter and stifle the aspirations and the hopes of the industrious and honest people of the land, or are we going to loosen the yoke of taxation a little bit and practice here such economies as will assist in the restoration of confidence throughout the land?

The enormous taxes that were piled up upon this particular land in California are not different in character from the various taxes that are imposed upon land in my State and in your State. A special tax on this, a special tax on that, and now we are called upon to impose still greater

burdens upon the American taxpayer by increasing the Federal taxes.

Little wonder that there appeared this dispatch from St. Paul, Minn., November 4, reading, "Tax cuts forced in Minnesota by demonstrations of citizens." It says:

Concerted action is effective in reducing taxes, say residents of several Minnesota areas. Taxpayers' associations, with farmers and city folk as members, have sprung up generally in the State, seeking relief from levies which they consider burdensome. An illustration of their success is seen in the action of the Faribault County Board, which reduced its budget \$45,000 after 2,000 persons had met on the courthouse lawn. It eliminated agricultural and home demonstration agents and weed inspectors and slashed road and bridge construction funds. Similar marches are planned in other counties.

Here is an article which appeared in the New York Times last fall, September 14, with headlines as follows: "County tax cuts demanded in West," "Citizens' groups put pressure on boards in Missouri, Kansas, and Minnesota."

Another article from another great newspaper carries the news article with headlines "Cuts in county taxes are demanded in West."

In the New York Times there appears another article, dated October 3, 1931, stating that taxpayers have started an assessment fight and are demanding that the budget be cut.

Here is the Daily Times, published in New York State. In big headlines it reads "One thousand taxpayers combat assessment increase."

Here is a paper from Nebraska, from which I read in big headlines, that an organization was formed in that section to protest appropriations and effect some savings.

Here is the St. Paul Dispatch, dated November 2, and on the front page in big headlines I read "Cut taxes, farmers cry," "Two thousand storm courthouse at Blue Earth," "Demand elimination of county agent and nurse positions."

In another New York paper I read this news from the front page "Veto unanimous as crowd storms room," "Action of board follows vigorous protest from aroused taxpayers; in midst of excitement fire chief threatens to call State troopers; mayor tries to explain."

From Chicago, both the Tribune and the Journal of Commerce carry in flaming headlines the meetings of the business people to protest against bureaucratic waste and demand savings in Government expenditures.

What is the further picture?

There is a deficit of \$903,000,000 in the fiscal year 1931, a deficit of \$2,123,000,000 for the fiscal year 1932, and an estimated deficit of \$1,700,000,000 for the fiscal year 1933, all of which we are called upon to meet. These deficits have brought in striking manner to the American people these large Government expenditures. They are watching the action of the American Congress as never before to see that we refrain in these distressed times further raids upon the Treasury. They want us, at least for the time being, to retrench and save. They desire that the least increase in taxes be imposed—of course, taking into consideration the economic administration of the Government.

This is why I am prompted to-day to say something about the matter as related to the ideas expressed in the resolution which I introduced in the Senate just before the Christmas holidays, expressing it as the sense of this body that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate should pare down appropriations under the Budget estimates to the extent of at least \$300,000,000 this year. I know it is said, "How are we going to do it?" The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, following the introduction of that resolution, wrote me a very courteous letter expressing a hope for cooperation on his part, but suggesting to me to specify as near as possible wherein these reductions could be made. I do not assume to have as much knowledge about this matter as other Senators who now honor me with their attention. I do not assume to have the knowledge possessed by those Senators who have served for years upon the Appropriations Committee and who have delved into the various machinations of the governmental agencies and bureaus. But I do know that when we look back to 1924 and

see that the appropriations for that year were hundreds of millions of dollars less than they were for the year 1932, and that only 10 or 15 years ago they amounted in some instances to hardly more than one-fourth of what they are to-day, we must all realize that there are places where we can reduce and we ought to reduce them in the interest of restoring confidence among the American people and bringing about a satisfactory readjustment of business conditions.

There is no industry in the country that does not feel the weight and the seriousness of the situation. They are all trying to economize and readjust. They do not know how long this debacle is going to last. It started more than two years ago. Most of us believed then—I know that I did, and we were all led to believe it by utterances of men higher up and by the general situation—that it was only a passing incident; that based on past experience it would last but a few months and we would return to normal prosperity. But we have groped our way through a labyrinth of darkness and despair for more than two years now, and instead of the condition getting better, we all know that it is growing worse; that it is worse to-day than it was last week, and that it was worse last week than it was two years ago. We do not know how long it is going to last.

We must first analyze the situation from a governmental standpoint as the captains of industry are doing in their various lines of business in order to save their own concerns from going into the hands of receivers and into bankruptcy. The first thing they tried to do naturally was to economize, to save, and that is what the Government ought to do. If we save \$300,000,000 by reducing the amounts contained in the recommendations of the Budget Bureau for our expenditures, then we naturally will not have to put that much more on the people in the way of increased taxes when the tax bill is brought here for consideration.

Tell me the American people are not interested! Tell me they want us to continue with this wild orgy of expenditures! In my State there was appointed a publicity man who was put in the legislature, whose duty it is to sound a warning through publicity of the votes of the legislators who vote for increased appropriations.

The chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations has asked, "Where and how are we going to reduce appropriations?" If I were chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I would do just what the President and the Director of the Budget could readily do. The various governmental departments and bureaus go to the Director of the Budget with their estimates. Naturally they ask for a great deal. Wherever we establish a new bureau in our Government, the man at the head of it wants to be just as big, and just as prominent, and just as influential as the head of any other bureau, and he wants to do that by having more employees around him than the head of another bureau. They are all vying in a mad race of competition for prominence and standing in the matter of expenditures.

But the Director of the Budget may say, "You must cut your demands 5 per cent or 10 per cent," whatever the case may be. That may have been done in the past. The report of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget then goes to the President, and the President can himself then say, "You must cut your demands 5 or 10 per cent more." Now, I inquire what is wrong with the Congress, through its appropriations committees, saying to every department and bureau in the Government, "You have got to cut your demands at least 10 per cent under the Budget recommendations?"

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator examined the Budget recommendations and the recommendations of the President under the Budget, and does he then say that those reductions have been ordered?

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator misunderstood me.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Mississippi is wholly mistaken. The recommendations made by the President and the Budget are practically as great as they have ever

been, and it is a mistake to say that they are making recommendations for great slashes.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator misunderstood me completely.

Mr. McKELLAR. I must have done so.

Mr. HARRISON. I was merely citing, as an illustration of how it might occur, that the Director of the Budget could tell the heads of the departments they must cut their demands 5 per cent, or perhaps 10 per cent, and that the President might do the same thing. I was not speaking of the present recommendations or the present Budget.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very glad to have the Senator's explanation, because no such recommendation has been made by the Budget.

Mr. HARRISON. There have been some cuts in this particular report of the Budget Bureau, but I am arguing, in no defense of what they are doing, that we here have a responsibility upon us and that we ought to cut by at least 10 per cent the demands of the various departments. I would say to the heads of the departments, "Your demands must be reduced by so much." If we do that, we will make more than \$300,000,000 in savings this fiscal year. I would say to them, "You know where you can cut without affecting the efficiency of your organization; we want you to do it; if you do not do it, we are going to apply the ax ourselves," just as was done the other day in the House when the deficiency bill was reported. When it came on the floor of the House it had been cut 10 per cent.

I know we can not effect any saving in the interest charges which the Government is required to pay, and which amount to upward of \$600,000,000; I know that, perhaps, we can not cut—I will not say that we can not do so, but it would be difficult to cut the sinking fund, but we could do it, if we desired it, in view of the rapid retirement of the national debt. I know we are in duty bound to meet the requirements of the Veterans' Bureau, which amount to more than \$900,000,000 a year; but there are innumerable and numerous appropriations outside of those to which I have just referred where we could cut and cut to the bone.

The President the other day gave out a statement to the effect that provision should be made for the consolidation of some of the departments and that we could thereby effect some saving. There is not any doubt about that. I look now into the benign countenance of my good friend from Utah [Mr. Smoot]. He and I served on a joint committee on the reorganization back in 1921. That joint committee considered this question until 1925. The President had appointed an executive agency to cooperate with us in that work, and we reported a bill; but the difficulty which we encountered all the time—and the Senator from Utah will agree with me in this—was in getting the heads of the executive departments to consent to any consolidation. There was the trouble. So about the only consolidation that we have been able to effect, notwithstanding the long, tedious study of the question, was in the case of the Veterans' Bureau, in putting the Patent Office under the Department of Commerce and also in putting the Bureau of Mines under that department.

There has been a suggestion to the effect that the Army and Navy should be consolidated. Those two departments used to be together; when the Government was founded the wise men of that day put the Navy and the Army under one head; but the great difficulty about the Government service is that when a consolidation is proposed there is extreme dislike to dismiss somebody, some useless appendages, and they are retained in the service; so the saving which was contemplated by virtue of the consolidation or coordination is not accomplished.

I tell you, Mr. President, that in times like these we have got to shoulder the responsibility; we have got to move with the highest degree of courage. We will step on toes, and, perhaps, in some instances our action may react against us in the future; we may make somebody mad; but the country in times like these should come first and must be preserved intact.

There is at the present time, as we all know, a tremendous deficit in the Treasury. Because of existing conditions and circumstances the bonds of the Government are going down, some of them selling, I believe, as low as 84. Of course, in such a situation as that we have got, above everything else, to cut down governmental expenditures and at the same time balance the Budget within a reasonable time. That is what we must do, and that is what we on this side of the House are going to do, so far as we can, in cooperation with the other side, in order to restore confidence on the part of the American people and preserve the value of Government and American securities, so that even though governments throughout the world may topple and crumble and fall the people of the United States may look forward to this Government standing solid and firm and its securities remaining intact. That will be our policy. We can not afford and will not allow the credit of this Government to become impaired or the slightest doubt arise as to its true value and worth.

Mr. President, we hear the question asked, Where are we going to cut? I have stated where some cuts may be made. I can not understand, for instance, why at this time, long after we built ships at a cost of \$3,000,000,000 or more, the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the Shipping Board should continue as separate units in the Government service at the enormous costs they demand.

Mr. KING. We ought to abolish them both.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not know as to that, but I do know that the men who are charged with the responsibility of administering the various departments should consider where economies may be effected and then cut to the quick.

I remember some years ago the distinguished Presiding Officer of this body offered an amendment to a then pending bill, which amendment was adopted, providing for the consolidation of customs ports of entry throughout the country. There was a hullabaloo raised. The people of the various cities affected did not want to have their customs offices consolidated with an office in another place, but the consolidation was effected and a saving of \$300,000 a year resulted. There has been some consolidation with reference to purchasing fuel in the District of Columbia. That coordination has been successful; it has effected a large saving. I think there ought to be one purchasing agency for buying materials necessary for the operation of the various departments of the Government. When that shall have been done, more savings will be effected.

There is not any doubt that we are appropriating much money uselessly and foolishly at this particular time. Much has been said in the past about the large expenditures for Government bulletins. We all send out such bulletins; I used to send a form letter to every farmer in the old congressional district which I represented in the other body, inclosing a farmer's bulletin; I should like to do it now; but I know, at this particular time, when the country is suffering and we must bring the Government back to a sound basis, that the farmers of my State would be willing to forego receiving farmers' bulletins for at least two years.

They want to keep in the retrenchment program. They demand a saving in taxes and a reduction in Government expenditures.

In the Department of Commerce the expenditures have increased proportionately more than in any other department of the Government. Let me read the figures showing how the appropriations for that department have increased. Last Sunday the Washington Post printed a special section of about 14 pages praising the Department of Commerce to the skies. Every activity of that department was mentioned and the fine work done elaborated upon. On the front page was a magnificent picture of the new Department of Commerce Building, located on Pennsylvania Avenue, in order to erect which it was necessary to tear down some fine structures and to pay large sums of money to property owners in order to secure the site. That was all right in prosperous times when we were building up a surplus; but at this particular time it gave me a peculiar feeling when I recalled the situation existing that has been depicted by the Senator from Wisconsin of people going hungry and people out of

employment throughout the country, with spirits broken and hope in thousands of instances gone. Here [exhibiting] on the front page of the section of the Washington Post devoted to the Department of Commerce is a picture of the new building and also pictures of the President and of the Secretary of Commerce, and in big letters the words, "Department of Commerce home greatest of office buildings. Monumental pile, costing \$17,500,000, expresses aspiration of Nation, dating from Alexander Hamilton's time, to develop business activities of the country not only for the American people but for the whole world * * *."

"Department of Commerce home baffles writers trying to visualize structure."

"Mass of data overwhelms statisticians trying comparisons."

"Akron, largest dirigible, 265 feet short of new Commerce site."

The building covers blocks and blocks. The article in the Post describes the beautiful tiling that was laid in this building, that approaches, if it does not surpass, Solomon's Temple in all its grandeur and majesty and beauty. That building has been opened at this time of economic depression and suffering throughout the country.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I have been told the Department of Commerce Building cost \$5,000 per room, being perhaps the most costly building in the United States. Certainly the cost of that building can not be justified.

Mr. HARRISON. In 1922, only a few years ago, shortly after the great World War, when we said we were going to economize and stop extravagant expenditures, at a time when we realized that our national debt was over \$25,000,000,000—and something must be done to retire it—the appropriations for the Commerce Department were \$16,000,000. Last year we appropriated for the Department of Commerce \$54,775,000, and in the estimate for the department this year there is quite a large item to extend our foreign trade throughout the world. I do not want during the course of these few remarks to touch on anything political or partisan, but I can not help express the thought that it is foolish for us to tax the American people in order to make large appropriations to extend our foreign trade and almost in the next breath, through some other policy enacted by the Government, keep foreign nations from trading with us. The Bureau of Foreign Commerce in the Department of Commerce shows a most amazing increase in the number of persons employed, a greater increase perhaps than is shown by any other bureau in any other department in the whole Federal service. Some one may say they got started that way a few years ago, but it is not being stopped now.

Mr. President, we could forego for a little while the expenditure of the \$20,000,000 that we are using for the preparation and publication of bulletins. One hundred million of them were printed last year, 40 per cent being printed under the direction of the Department of Commerce and Department of Agriculture. Those bulletins contain advice and directions regarding everything from "the essentials of a well-planned kitchen" to "the making of a basket out of pine needles." They touch everything that is imaginable. They tell us "that a folding lounge is the last word in relaxation," and "that the abdomen is the belly." Let me, for the edification of the Senate, cite a few of the striking bulletins which are being printed by the Government.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, while the Senator is doing that, will he permit a suggestion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator will comment upon the fact that many of the bureaus and all the departments have a very large and expensive publicity organization, so that whatever is done, valuable or invaluable—and largely it is invaluable—receives widespread publicity, and newspaper men when they go to the departments are often-

times deluged with huge tons of stuff prepared by the publicity bureaus of the Government departments at enormous expense.

Mr. HARRISON. And just such useless employees as those ought, at least during these times, to be divorced from the Government service. Of course, it is hard to talk about dismissing anyone now; but, Mr. President, this Government was not founded merely to give people jobs; it was not founded merely to give people higher salaries than are paid in the industries throughout the country; it was created to preserve the happiness, safeguard the freedom and liberties, and protect the lives and property of the American people. Yet we hear some say, "Oh, you must not touch us because you will affect our salaries."

In times like these we must look to the welfare of all the people rather than the salaries of some of the people.

It is no time for selfish consideration to engage our attention. It is an unusual situation that must be handled in a way that ordinarily we would not consider, but the exigencies of the case demanded it.

I will now refer to some of these striking bulletins that were issued last year at great cost. First, I refer to some issued by the Department of Agriculture:

Utilization of the Calcium in Spinach. No doubt that will relieve many farmers who are in distress.

Lamb as You Like It. What department, whether the Agricultural Department or any other, can tell me the way lamb should be cooked as I like it.

Reindeer Recipes.

Bringing Up Bobby. That tells how to bring up children. It ought to come under the Children's Bureau.

The Use of the Metric System in Nutrition. [Laughter.]

Principles of Window Curtaining. That bulletin, which I have here, informs the reader that curtains are sometimes used to keep out the light from the rooms in which they are hung, and sometimes, it states, privacy can be brought about by the employment of curtains. Wonderful, striking information that these bulletins carry to the people—such information that the Government could not afford now to stop or to dispense with it!

Suits for the Small Boy. They tell the people what suits are good for the small boy now.

Children's Rompers. [Laughter.] They have pictures of children's rompers in this one. It is a beautiful thing, and it tells you not to fit the rompers too tight; that they must be loose, because if they are fitted in such a way as to be too close the children will be deformed when they grow up. I would like to read that bulletin and show you just what it does say, but I will not do it.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BROOKHART. I should like to ask the Senator if the department did any of those foolish things when the Democrats were in power?

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, I presume so. I think the Democrats have done a lot of foolish things, too. I am just applying my thoughts to present-day conditions, however. I do not care whether the Democrats inaugurated the policy or carried it on or whether the Republicans are now carrying on some foolish work that the Democrats started; it ought to be stopped for the time being.

How to Dress for a Sun Bath. Now, that is a wonderful thing. [Laughter.] When I was a boy I did not dress for a sun bath, but the Department of Agriculture tells you now how to do it.

Where Sheets Wear Out. [Laughter.]

The Self-Help Bib.

Self-Help Suits for the Small Boy.

A Study of the Time Spent in the Care of Babies.

Vitamins in Relation to Salad Dressing.

Those are a few that were issued last year. Here are some other pamphlets they issued:

A Study of Housing in Relation to Family Development.

There is a document that cost a good deal of money to print. It has a world of questions that they send out broad-

cast, telling how to live at home; how to make the home comfortable; and one of these questions, as I read it along, asks you which room is used for love-making. [Laughter.] That is about as far as the Government has ever ventured in prying into private affairs. That is the character of pamphlets and bulletins that are being sent out at Government expense—100,000,000 copies last year.

Ah, they answer and say, "Some people buy them." I listened to my friend Julius Klein over the radio the other night, and he told how some fellow down in the Southwest had received a bulletin from the Government, and he had gone out and made I do not know how much money every month. It had even given him employment. The facts are that only a very few are sold. They are distributed at Government expense, and when I say at Government expense it does not mean the mere preparation and printing of the documents.

Let us visualize the cost involved. An expert, who is supposed to be trained in the special work assigned him in the preparation of some bulletin, is sent all over the country, or perhaps into foreign countries, to gather his information. The Government is not only paying this employee a salary but his expenses in the gathering of the data. Then when the data are collected other employees of the Government are used in the coordination of the work and in the final preparation of the document. After these expenses are incurred, in many instances upon a much larger scale than I have suggested, the document is turned over to be printed at the Government Printing Office. Then notices are prepared of this particular bulletin, together with others, and distributed by the Government in order to bring to the attention of the public this particular bulletin for distribution.

Only the other day in the Treasury report to this Congress the huge deficit in the Post Office Department was cited and one of the reasons for this deficit was the enormous distribution of Government bulletins. And so the expense of preparation, printing, and distribution of these bulletins and pamphlets does not enter alone into any one particular item in the expense of the Budget but it is carried through many other channels which are draining the Treasury of the United States.

References on Pre-Natal, Infant, and Child Care and Child Management.

Public Dance Halls. [Laughter.] That has about 100 pages.

Here is a statement of the way you ought to keep the temperature of a sick child, or a woman who is in distress.

What Builds Babies, with pictures illustrating how to do it.

Here is one that is written on Canal-Boat Children. [Laughter.] It tells you that there are but 353 in the whole United States, but they get out a pamphlet here of some 21 pages on how to care for these canal-boat children. That pamphlet was published while a distinguished gentleman was presiding over the Department of Labor, a man who apparently was trying to effect economies in the Government service and who favors me with his presence, my good friend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS].

What They Think of the Kindergarten.

Here is a good one from the Department of Labor, too. I do not think my friend there from Pennsylvania prepared this one. It was prepared by a man, may I say.

Breast-Feeding Demonstrations. [Laughter.]

Ensembles for Sunny Days.

I quote from this bulletin:

When days are hot and children need few clothes, a sun-suit ensemble is ideal. The cool romper with its net top to catch the ultra-violet rays is just right for play in the back yard.

[Laughter.]

Great information that we are getting out! Why, Mr. President, they even had one—I have not it here, but I read it with interest; it was one of the most fascinating and interesting pieces of literature that has come to my attention in years. It is on frogs. It told of the "love adventures of the American bullfrog." [Laughter.]

Before reading this romantic story of the frog I thought I knew something about frogs. When I was a boy I was their pal. I carry to this day living evidence of my close

contact with them; but not until reading this bulletin did I realize some characteristics of the adventurous bullfrog. It told how courageous he was, and that as he and his fair Juliet sat in the sun rays upon some old log in a lonesome river, at the first approach of footsteps or noise the gentleman frog would jump off ahead to notify his fair lady that she must get out of danger also. It gave me the very refreshing information that the gentleman frog only croaks or sings when he is in love. [Laughter.]

Then they have a pamphlet here on how to make a cat trap. It tells you that after you remove the cat from the cat trap, if you will get a sack and put it over his head, you can take him out to the river and drown him without his escaping or knowing anything about it. [Laughter.]

The Department of Agriculture, as I understand, is now investigating the building of a statue to the American pig. They are going to get some modern Michelangelo to carve from marble, or bronze or something, the perfect hog. They are going to have it done in various types and models. They are going to exhibit these to the farmers throughout the country to encourage hog raising. [Laughter.]

I hope that when they start these wonderful specimens of the hog there will be no fight raised between those who admire the Berkshire or the Chester or the Hampshire or the Jersey, and that they will give some consideration to that fleetest of all hogs, whose bristles may be a little stronger than possessed by other hogs, but whose spare-ribs are a little bit sweeter, though he may give a little less lard, and that is the fine old fast-moving long-snouted razorback. [Laughter.]

So those are the various preparations that we are making, and some of the work that they are doing that ought to be deferred, Mr. President, in these times. Why they have another pamphlet wherein through loga-(or hog)-rithm they are to tell in the spring what prices the farmers are to receive in the autumn for their hogs. They arrive at it through an algebraical process of regression equation.

I heard of an Englishman who came over here, and he was fascinated by our fireflies, or lightning bugs, as we call them in my country, and he wanted to find out something about them; so he inquired of a friend where in the world he could get information about the lightning bug. The friend said to him, of course, "We will go down to the Department of Agriculture and we will question them. Maybe we can get the information there."

They went, and after they had been shown through the labyrinths of the various offices and departments they came to a rosy checked, ascetic, mild-mannered, soft-speaking individual behind a desk, and he was the man who acknowledged that many years ago he had written such a bulletin. So he reached down into some old dust-covered pile of papers and books and finally brought out one of those lightning-bug bulletins and handed it to the Englishman and explained it to him. The Englishman, with face wreathed in smiles, said, "My friend, I want to thank you." This mild-mannered man said, "Don't! Don't thank me. For 20 years I gave study to that particular subject, and I put all my time and work on it, and you are the first man who has shown any interest in the lightning bug. Don't thank me. I thank you." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, some of this work could be stopped, or at least deferred for the time being.

I know how hard it is to cut salaries. I dislike to vote to reduce anybody's pay. I know that in the Government agencies here there are tens of thousands of underpaid employees. Some of them, perhaps, are overpaid. I have not any doubt that there is a surplus in every bureau of every department of the Government, however. In times like these, with the very stability of the Government threatened, with Government bonds declining, with deficits piling up, with demands more numerous every day coming upon us for increased appropriations, if it is necessary to balance the Budget and bring about some reform and economies, I am willing, as much as I dislike it, to vote to reduce the wages of Government employees; and when I say that I am willing to reduce mine more than I am willing to reduce

theirs, though I know that there are some Senators here, if not all of you, who can stand reductions better than I.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FRAZIER. I have been very much interested in what the Senator from Mississippi has said. I was called from the Chamber and did not hear all of his remarks; but I am interested to know whether he does not think that under the present conditions this would be a good time to make a good, big cut in the appropriations for the Navy Department and the War Department.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. Before the Senator came in I said I would cut the appropriations of every one of the departments of the Government 10 per cent. If Senators want to cut them more than that, without affecting too much the efficiency of the departments, I am willing to do that. I said to the Senate that I read with surprise and regret the announcement that a bill had been introduced the other day providing \$600,000,000 for the Navy.

Mr. FRAZIER. I think there might be a great deal more than 10 per cent cut there without any detriment to the Government.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I read the other day in a paper from my own State where the highway commission of that State said that they had saved in road construction, on the contracts just being let out, more than 20 per cent on costs of materials alone. Things have gone down. The cost of living is not as high as it was, due to the situation that exists over the country. We appropriate \$125,000,000 a year for road construction. I have been a great advocate of road building, but I know that \$100,000,000 to-day will go as far as \$125,000,000 in road construction three years ago, and some economies might be worked out whereby we might save some of these expenditures.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. I desire to call the Senator's attention to this fact: The States, as he said, spent last year about a billion dollars on hard-road construction. This hard-road construction was started by the Federal Government on the theory of the Federal Government and the State each paying 50-50; but the big taxpayers did not like that, and they organized road-boosters' associations, and they boosted for gasoline taxes and for county bonds and State bonds to increase the States' part of that fund to \$900,000,000 or so, whereas the Federal Government's part is now down to only \$125,000,000. Does not the Senator think that it would be a fair deal for the Federal Government to pay its share of this road construction, and to tax the big fortunes of the country, which in turn have taxed the people of the country and brought on this condition?

Mr. HARRISON. May I say to the Senator that much as I regret increasing taxes at this time, I am in favor of increasing them sufficiently to balance, within a reasonable time, the Budget of the Government.

As to the Senator's road-building proposition, I think an individual ought to look at these propositions from the Government's standpoint the same as he would look at them if he himself were letting out a contract and trying to make a living, and apply some business methods to the matter. A few years ago we started a big public-construction program. That was fine, but when we inaugurated it we did not believe that this depression was going to last as long as it has lasted, and at that time there was no probability of its continuing to last as long as it probably will last. If present conditions continue, and we prolong indefinitely such a program, in the end it will bankrupt the Government.

If we are to spend in running the Government billions and billions of dollars by paying wages higher than those paid by anybody else, and pay higher for materials than anybody else pays, we can not hope to readjust the affairs of the Government.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am enlisted for the purpose of trying to retrench in public expenditures and trying to readjust the economic affairs of this country

as quickly as possible and cooperating in the creation of agencies designed to save money, although we may be mistaken as to the good they will bring, and I shall join in enacting legislation designed to give confidence to the American people.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON. I wanted to ask the Senator whether he had given any consideration to the advisability of dismissing a lot of people working in the departments, as well as to the question of cutting the wages of those employed?

Mr. HARRISON. I may say to the Senator that three heads of departments, whose names, of course, I would not

care to mention, told me that if the Government would adopt a policy of cutting out the 30 days annual leave and cutting out too many holidays, when, naturally, they must draw in their surplus help in order to fill the places, and then, by an Executive order, say they are not going to take into the Government service any more employees, but that as vacancies occur by death, resignation, or otherwise, those in the service will be promoted, that that would effect tremendous savings. One plant in my own State, with only a limited number of people employed, has stated that through such a process as that they would save in that one institution \$20,000 a year. I thank the Senator for the suggestion.

EXHIBITS

Number of employees in the executive service

| Government establishments | June 30, 1913 | | | June 30, 1916 | | | Nov. 11, 1918 | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|---------|----------------------|---------|---------|----------------------|---------|---------|
| | District of Columbia | Field | Total | District of Columbia | Field | Total | District of Columbia | Field | Total |
| 1 Department of State | 267 | 1,118 | 1,385 | 283 | 1,118 | 1,401 | 686 | 2,550 | 3,236 |
| 2 Department of the Treasury | 7,520 | 23,482 | 31,002 | 8,209 | 22,300 | 30,509 | 28,535 | 31,179 | 59,714 |
| 3 Department of War | 2,248 | 29,154 | 31,402 | 2,266 | 31,674 | 33,940 | 37,406 | 214,228 | 251,634 |
| 4 Department of Justice | 510 | 3,241 | 3,751 | 525 | 3,670 | 4,195 | 1,725 | 5,275 | 6,000 |
| 5 Post Office Department | 1,612 | 275,000 | 276,612 | 1,582 | 282,000 | 283,582 | 1,900 | 286,000 | 287,900 |
| 6 Department of the Navy | 1,165 | 22,909 | 24,074 | 1,264 | 28,191 | 29,455 | 12,715 | 96,147 | 108,862 |
| 7 Department of the Interior | 5,172 | 13,732 | 18,904 | 4,966 | 15,167 | 20,133 | 4,876 | 13,780 | 18,656 |
| 8 Department of Agriculture | 3,659 | 11,761 | 15,420 | 4,670 | 14,066 | 18,736 | 6,100 | 18,514 | 24,614 |
| 9 Department of Commerce | 1,708 | 7,080 | 8,788 | 1,697 | 7,720 | 9,417 | 2,527 | 7,729 | 10,256 |
| 10 Department of Labor | 240 | 1,760 | 2,000 | 375 | 1,672 | 2,047 | 1,891 | 5,050 | 6,941 |
| 11 Government Printing Office | 4,037 | | 4,037 | 4,028 | | 4,028 | 5,280 | | 5,280 |
| 12 Smithsonian Institution | 735 | | 735 | 784 | | 784 | 368 | | 368 |
| 13 Interstate Commerce Commission | 736 | 63 | 799 | 928 | 1,315 | 2,243 | 803 | 1,323 | 2,126 |
| 14 Civil Service Commission | 184 | 31 | 215 | 215 | 35 | 250 | 654 | 50 | 704 |
| 15 U. S. Bureau of Efficiency | | | | 27 | | 27 | 38 | | 38 |
| 16 Federal Trade Commission | | | | 57 | | 57 | 697 | | 697 |
| 17 U. S. Shipping Board | | | | 238 | | 238 | 1,129 | 8,559 | 9,688 |
| 18 U. S. Railroad Administration | | | | | | | 1,163 | | 1,163 |
| 19 U. S. Food Administration | | | | | | | 1,750 | 900 | 2,650 |
| 20 U. S. Fuel Administration | | | | | | | 1,948 | | 1,948 |
| 21 Council of National Defense | | | | | | | 323 | | 323 |
| 22 War Industries Board | | | | | | | 1,295 | | 1,295 |
| 23 War Trade Board | | | | | | | 2,338 | | 2,338 |
| 24 Alien Property Custodian | | | | | | | 590 | | 590 |
| 25 U. S. Tariff Commission | | | | | | | 69 | | 69 |
| 26 Employees' Compensation Commission | | | | | | | 48 | | 48 |
| 27 U. S. Federal Board for Vocational Education | | | | | | | 140 | 106 | 246 |
| 28 The Panama Canal | 162 | 1,232 | 1,394 | 153 | 943 | 1,096 | 110 | 2,888 | 2,998 |
| 29 Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board | | | | | | | 2 | | 2 |
| 30 Superintendent, State, War, and Navy Building | 234 | | 234 | 217 | | 217 | 1,694 | | 1,694 |
| Total | 30,189 | 390,563 | | 32,544 | 409,931 | | 116,800 | 694,278 | |
| Grand total | | | 420,752 | | | 442,475 | | | 811,078 |

| Government establishments | June 30, 1919 | | | Mar. 31, 1920 | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|---------|----------------------|---------|---------|
| | District of Columbia | Field | Total | District of Columbia | Field | Total |
| 1 Department of State | 778 | 2,585 | 3,363 | 814 | 2,835 | 3,649 |
| 2 Department of the Treasury | 31,311 | 31,081 | 62,392 | 31,489 | 37,213 | 68,702 |
| 3 Department of War | 26,562 | 185,000 | 211,562 | 18,985 | 175,000 | 193,985 |
| 4 Department of Justice | 1,600 | 5,100 | 6,700 | 1,712 | 5,188 | 6,900 |
| 5 Post Office Department | 1,860 | 284,377 | 286,237 | 1,860 | 287,633 | 289,493 |
| 6 Department of the Navy | 10,755 | 110,078 | 120,833 | 12,532 | 83,379 | 95,911 |
| 7 Department of the Interior | 5,178 | 13,970 | 19,148 | 5,525 | 11,685 | 17,210 |
| 8 Department of Agriculture | 5,157 | 17,506 | 22,663 | 4,604 | 14,417 | 19,021 |
| 9 Department of Commerce | 2,807 | 8,125 | 10,932 | 5,277 | 5,157 | 10,434 |
| 10 Department of Labor | 1,536 | 2,715 | 4,251 | 705 | 1,619 | 2,324 |
| 11 Government Printing Office | 4,793 | | 4,793 | 4,917 | | 4,917 |
| 12 Smithsonian Institution | 467 | | 467 | 486 | | 486 |
| 13 Interstate Commerce Commission | 834 | 1,382 | 2,216 | 858 | 886 | 1,744 |
| 14 Civil Service Commission | 466 | 52 | 518 | 338 | 28 | 366 |
| 15 U. S. Bureau of Efficiency | 32 | | 32 | 62 | | 62 |
| 16 Federal Trade Commission | 377 | | 377 | 485 | | 485 |
| 17 U. S. Shipping Board | 2,335 | 8,917 | 11,252 | 2,137 | 6,826 | 8,963 |
| 18 U. S. Railroad Administration | 1,324 | | 1,324 | 1,002 | | 1,002 |
| 19 U. S. Food Administration | 150 | | 150 | | | (9) |
| 20 U. S. Fuel Administration | 115 | | 115 | | | (9) |
| 21 Council of National Defense | 114 | | 114 | 68 | | 68 |
| 22 War Industries Board | 9 | | 9 | | | (9) |
| 23 War Trade Board | 267 | | 267 | 25 | | 25 |
| 24 Alien Property Custodian | 438 | | 438 | 256 | | 256 |
| 25 U. S. Tariff Commission | 45 | | 45 | 94 | | 94 |
| 26 Employees' Compensation Commission | 60 | | 60 | 73 | | 73 |
| 27 U. S. Federal Board for Vocational Education | 684 | 1,638 | 2,322 | 995 | 2,317 | 3,312 |
| 28 The Panama Canal | 110 | 2,914 | 3,024 | 109 | 4,174 | 4,283 |
| 29 Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board | 16 | 98 | 114 | 37 | 138 | 175 |
| 30 Superintendent, State, War, and Navy Building | 1,860 | | 1,860 | 1,821 | | 1,821 |
| Total | 100,640 | 675,538 | | 96,266 | 638,495 | |
| Grand total | | | 776,178 | | | 734,761 |

Footnotes at end of table.

Number of employees in the executive service—Continued

| Government establishments | July 31, 1921 | | | June 30, 1922 | | | June 30, 1923 | | |
|------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|---------|----------------------|---------|---------|----------------------|---------|---------|
| | District of Columbia | Field | Total | District of Columbia | Field | Total | District of Columbia | Field | Total |
| 0 The White House | 42 | | 42 | (?) | | | (?) | | |
| 1 Department of State | 655 | 3,078 | 3,733 | 595 | 3,257 | 3,852 | 582 | 3,423 | 4,005 |
| 2 Department of the Treasury | 26,704 | 46,526 | 73,230 | 19,860 | 36,110 | 55,970 | 18,634 | 36,777 | 55,411 |
| 3 Department of War | 6,429 | 62,115 | 68,544 | 4,921 | 46,358 | 51,279 | 4,470 | 46,689 | 51,159 |
| 4 Department of Justice | 721 | 2,360 | 3,081 | 571 | 2,400 | 2,971 | 653 | 2,700 | 3,353 |
| 5 Post Office Department | 3,664 | 284,611 | 288,275 | 3,630 | 279,008 | 282,638 | 3,425 | 282,397 | 285,822 |
| 6 Department of the Navy | 9,649 | 60,100 | 69,749 | 7,377 | 48,470 | 55,847 | 5,418 | 37,424 | 42,842 |
| 7 Department of the Interior | 5,829 | 13,876 | 19,705 | 5,380 | 12,039 | 17,419 | 5,551 | 12,942 | 18,493 |
| 8 Department of Agriculture | 4,676 | 14,503 | 19,179 | 4,822 | 14,882 | 19,704 | 4,933 | 15,328 | 20,261 |
| 9 Department of Commerce | 4,244 | 8,802 | 13,046 | 2,755 | 8,458 | 11,213 | 2,794 | 8,678 | 11,472 |
| 10 Department of Labor | 1,166 | 2,667 | 3,833 | 1,161 | 2,364 | 3,525 | 1,083 | 2,632 | 3,715 |
| 11 Government Printing Office | 4,464 | | 4,464 | 4,111 | | 4,111 | 3,879 | | 3,879 |
| 12 Smithsonian Institution | 487 | | 487 | 509 | | 509 | 484 | | 484 |
| 13 Interstate Commerce Commission | 1,228 | 691 | 1,919 | 1,547 | 251 | 1,798 | 1,401 | 284 | 1,685 |
| 14 Civil Service Commission | 361 | 24 | 385 | 379 | 30 | 409 | 378 | 130 | 508 |
| 15 Bureau of Efficiency | 55 | | 55 | 50 | | 50 | 53 | | 53 |
| 16 Federal Trade Commission | 318 | | 318 | 318 | | 318 | 308 | | 308 |
| 17 U. S. Shipping Board | 2,302 | 4,273 | 6,575 | 1,888 | 2,182 | 4,070 | 1,418 | 1,636 | 3,054 |
| 18 U. S. Railroad Administration | 1,214 | 113 | 1,327 | 1,123 | 124 | 1,247 | 971 | 67 | 1,038 |
| 19 U. S. Food Administration | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 U. S. Fuel Administration | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 Council of National Defense | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 War Industries Board | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 War Trade Board | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 Alien Property Custodian | 162 | | 162 | 139 | | 139 | 131 | | 131 |
| 25 U. S. Tariff Commission | 99 | | 99 | 96 | | 96 | 190 | | 190 |
| 26 Employees' Compensation Commission | 79 | | 79 | 78 | | 78 | 74 | | 74 |
| 27 Federal Board for Vocational Education | 972 | 5,439 | 6,411 | 80 | | 80 | 80 | | 80 |
| 28 Panama Canal | 105 | 9,250 | 9,355 | 69 | 8,346 | 8,415 | 71 | 7,923 | 7,994 |
| 29 Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board | 17 | 63 | 80 | | | | | | |
| 30 Public Buildings and Public Parks | 1,229 | | 1,229 | 1,006 | | 1,006 | 1,006 | | 1,304 |
| 31 General Accounting Office | 1,544 | | 1,544 | 2,006 | | 2,006 | 2,035 | | 2,035 |
| 32 Veterans' Administration | | | | 5,321 | 26,481 | 31,802 | 5,270 | 22,894 | 28,164 |
| 33 Commission of Fine Arts | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 War Finance Corporation | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 Federal Reserve Board | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 Board of Tax Appeals | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 Board of Mediation | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 Federal Power Commission | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 Federal Radio Commission | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 American Battle Monuments Commission | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 Federal Farm Board | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 Personnel Classification Board | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 Railroad Labor Board | | 76 | 76 | | 75 | 75 | | 67 | 67 |
| 45 Miscellaneous boards and commissions | 150 | 50 | 200 | 188 | 50 | 238 | 700 | 250 | 950 |
| Total | 78,865 | 518,617 | | 69,980 | 490,883 | | 66,290 | 482,241 | |
| Grand total | | | 597,482 | | | 560,863 | | | 548,531 |

| Government establishments | June 30, 1924 | | | June 30, 1925 | | |
|------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|---------|----------------------|---------|---------|
| | District of Columbia | Field | Total | District of Columbia | Field | Total |
| 0 The White House | (?) | | | 46 | | 46 |
| 1 Department of State | 593 | 4,104 | 4,697 | 618 | 3,632 | 4,250 |
| 2 Department of the Treasury | 17,057 | 35,235 | 52,292 | 16,325 | 37,108 | 53,433 |
| 3 Department of War | 4,266 | 46,094 | 50,360 | 4,898 | 47,489 | 52,387 |
| 4 Department of Justice | 631 | 3,000 | 3,631 | 841 | 2,965 | 3,806 |
| 5 Post Office Department | 3,707 | 292,774 | 296,481 | 3,822 | 297,877 | 301,699 |
| 6 Department of the Navy | 5,250 | 36,721 | 41,971 | 5,197 | 37,072 | 42,269 |
| 7 Department of the Interior | 5,485 | 12,355 | 17,840 | 3,927 | 13,346 | 17,273 |
| 8 Department of Agriculture | 4,920 | 15,745 | 20,665 | 4,916 | 15,686 | 20,602 |
| 9 Department of Commerce | 2,799 | 8,861 | 11,660 | 4,943 | 8,975 | 13,918 |
| 10 Department of Labor | 961 | 2,785 | 3,746 | 654 | 3,454 | 4,108 |
| 11 Government Printing Office | 4,094 | | 4,094 | 3,937 | | 3,937 |
| 12 Smithsonian Institution | 488 | | 488 | 495 | | 495 |
| 13 Interstate Commerce Commission | 1,287 | 255 | 1,542 | 1,231 | 304 | 1,535 |
| 14 Civil Service Commission | 380 | 118 | 498 | 333 | 130 | 463 |
| 15 Bureau of Efficiency | 49 | | 49 | 47 | | 47 |
| 16 Federal Trade Commission | 315 | | 315 | 314 | | 314 |
| 17 U. S. Shipping Board | 1,250 | 1,865 | 3,115 | 986 | 1,079 | 2,065 |
| 18 U. S. Railroad Administration | 558 | 19 | 577 | 239 | 26 | 265 |
| 19 U. S. Food Administration | | | | | | |
| 20 U. S. Fuel Administration | | | | | | |
| 21 Council of National Defense | | | | | | |
| 22 War Industries Board | | | | | | |
| 23 War Trade Board | | | | | | |
| 24 Alien Property Custodian | 114 | | 114 | 208 | | 208 |
| 25 U. S. Tariff Commission | 200 | | 200 | 187 | 14 | 201 |
| 26 Employees' Compensation Commission | 73 | | 73 | 68 | | 68 |
| 27 Federal Board for Vocational Education | 74 | | 74 | 73 | | 73 |
| 28 Panama Canal | 73 | 8,817 | 8,890 | 75 | 8,835 | 8,910 |
| 29 Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board | | | | | | |
| 30 Public Buildings and Public Parks | 1,520 | | 1,520 | 2,199 | | 2,199 |
| 31 General Accounting Office | 2,042 | | 2,042 | 1,956 | | 1,956 |
| 32 Veterans' Administration | 5,234 | 21,801 | 27,035 | 4,897 | 22,647 | 27,544 |
| 33 Commission of Fine Arts | | | | 2 | | 2 |
| 34 War Finance Corporation | | | | 119 | 131 | 250 |
| 35 National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | | | | 23 | 111 | 134 |
| 36 Federal Reserve Board | | | | 180 | 18 | 198 |
| 37 Board of Tax Appeals | | | | | | |
| 38 Board of Mediation | | | | | | |
| 39 Federal Power Commission | | | | | | |
| 40 Federal Radio Commission | | | | | | |
| 41 American Battle Monuments Commission | | | | | | |

Footnotes at end of table.

Number of employees in the executive service—Continued

| Government establishments | | | June 30, 1924 | | | June 30, 1925 | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------|----------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------|
| | | | District of Columbia | Field | Total | District of Columbia | Field | Total |
| 42 | Federal Farm Board | | | | | | | |
| 43 | Personnel Classification Board | | | | | | | |
| 44 | Railroad Labor Board | | | 67 | 67 | | 63 | 63 |
| 45 | Miscellaneous boards and commissions | | 700 | 250 | 950 | | | |
| | Total | | 64, 120 | 490, 866 | | 63, 756 | 500, 962 | |
| | Grand total | | | | 554, 986 | | | 564, 718 |

| Government establishments | | | June 30, 1926 | | | June 30, 1927 | | | June 30, 1928 | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------|--|----------------------|----------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------|
| | | | District of Columbia | Field | Total | District of Columbia | Field | Total | District of Columbia | Field | Total |
| 0 | The White House | | 44 | | 44 | 46 | | 46 | 45 | | 45 |
| 1 | Department of State | | 609 | 3, 704 | 4, 313 | 609 | 3, 750 | 4, 359 | 601 | 3, 794 | 4, 395 |
| 2 | Department of the Treasury | | 14, 762 | 36, 857 | 51, 619 | 14, 090 | 37, 442 | 51, 532 | 13, 818 | 37, 689 | 51, 507 |
| 3 | Department of War | | 4, 575 | 44, 193 | 48, 768 | 4, 101 | 38, 191 | 42, 292 | 4, 024 | 41, 384 | 45, 408 |
| 4 | Department of Justice | | 836 | 2, 927 | 3, 763 | 724 | 2, 947 | 3, 671 | 768 | 3, 093 | 3, 861 |
| 5 | Post Office Department | | 3, 918 | 302, 067 | 305, 985 | 3, 906 | 304, 834 | 308, 740 | 3, 991 | 306, 944 | 310, 935 |
| 6 | Department of the Navy | | 5, 044 | 38, 396 | 43, 440 | 5, 576 | 37, 849 | 43, 425 | 6, 637 | 37, 531 | 44, 168 |
| 7 | Department of the Interior | | 3, 598 | 11, 137 | 14, 735 | 3, 465 | 12, 885 | 16, 350 | 3, 546 | 13, 375 | 16, 921 |
| 8 | Department of Agriculture | | 4, 792 | 15, 961 | 20, 753 | 4, 831 | 16, 871 | 21, 702 | 4, 884 | 17, 358 | 22, 242 |
| 9 | Department of Commerce | | 4, 365 | 10, 463 | 14, 828 | 4, 343 | 10, 621 | 14, 964 | 4, 621 | 11, 237 | 15, 858 |
| 10 | Department of Labor | | 667 | 3, 315 | 3, 982 | 619 | 3, 368 | 3, 987 | 644 | 3, 523 | 4, 167 |
| 11 | Government Printing Office | | 4, 077 | | 4, 077 | 4, 080 | | 4, 080 | 4, 050 | | 4, 050 |
| 12 | Smithsonian Institution | | 506 | | 506 | 528 | | 528 | 521 | | 521 |
| 13 | Interstate Commerce Commission | | 1, 346 | 461 | 1, 807 | 1, 372 | 545 | 1, 917 | 1, 395 | 636 | 2, 032 |
| 14 | Civil Service Commission | | 341 | 126 | 467 | 338 | 119 | 457 | 375 | 135 | 510 |
| 15 | U. S. Bureau of Efficiency | | 48 | | 48 | 71 | | 71 | 59 | | 59 |
| 16 | Federal Trade Commission | | 317 | | 317 | 293 | | 293 | 349 | | 349 |
| 17 | U. S. Shipping Board | | 813 | 691 | 1, 504 | 829 | 803 | 1, 632 | 835 | 840 | 1, 675 |
| 18 | U. S. Railroad Administration | | 113 | 8 | 121 | 47 | 3 | 50 | 32 | | 32 |
| 19 | U. S. Food Administration | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | U. S. Fuel Administration | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | Council of National Defense | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | War Industries Board | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | War Trade Board | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | Alien Property Custodian | | 252 | | 252 | 208 | | 208 | 185 | | 185 |
| 25 | U. S. Tariff Commission | | 190 | 14 | 204 | 196 | 10 | 206 | 221 | 11 | 232 |
| 26 | Employees' Compensation Commission | | 69 | | 69 | 71 | | 71 | 95 | | 155 |
| 27 | U. S. Federal Board for Vocational Education | | 75 | | 75 | 68 | | 68 | 68 | | 68 |
| 28 | The Panama Canal | | 75 | 9, 504 | 9, 579 | 75 | 9, 851 | 9, 926 | 77 | 10, 384 | 10, 461 |
| 29 | Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | Public Buildings and Public Parks | | 2, 453 | | 2, 453 | 2, 264 | | 2, 264 | 2, 370 | | 2, 370 |
| 31 | General Accounting Office | | 1, 965 | | 1, 965 | 1, 968 | | 1, 968 | 1, 944 | | 1, 944 |
| 32 | Veterans' Administration | | 4, 567 | 19, 830 | 24, 397 | 4, 657 | 19, 039 | 23, 696 | 4, 804 | 19, 129 | 23, 933 |
| 33 | Commission of Fine Arts | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | 2 |
| 34 | War Finance Corporation | | 80 | 91 | 171 | 41 | 45 | 86 | 22 | 20 | 42 |
| 35 | National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | | 24 | 131 | 155 | 23 | 146 | 169 | 33 | 164 | 197 |
| 36 | Federal Reserve Board | | 186 | 18 | 204 | 185 | 19 | 204 | 175 | 20 | 195 |
| 37 | Board of Tax Appeals | | 102 | | 102 | 137 | | 137 | 159 | | 159 |
| 38 | Board of Mediation | | | | | 37 | | 37 | 37 | | 37 |
| 39 | Federal Power Commission | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | Federal Radio Commission | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | American Battle Monuments Commission | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 | Federal Farm Board | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 | Personnel Classification Board | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | Railroad Labor Board | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | Miscellaneous boards and commissions | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | | 60, 811 | 499, 894 | | 59, 800 | 499, 338 | | 61, 388 | 507, 327 | |
| | Grand total | | | | 560, 705 | | | 559, 138 | | | 568, 715 |

| Government establishments | | | June 30, 1929 | | | June 30, 1930 | | | June 30, 1931 | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------------|----------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------|
| | | | District of Columbia | Field | Total | District of Columbia | Field | Total | District of Columbia | Field | Total |
| 0 | The White House | | 43 | | 43 | 45 | | 45 | 43 | | 43 |
| 1 | Department of State | | 661 | 3, 956 | 4, 617 | 714 | 3, 977 | 4, 691 | 824 | 4, 135 | 4, 959 |
| 2 | Department of the Treasury | | 14, 298 | 38, 796 | 53, 094 | 13, 436 | 39, 464 | 52, 900 | 13, 397 | 38, 347 | 51, 744 |
| 3 | Department of War | | 4, 170 | 43, 097 | 47, 267 | 4, 408 | 45, 881 | 50, 289 | 4, 251 | 49, 105 | 53, 356 |
| 4 | Department of Justice | | 832 | 3, 352 | 4, 184 | 922 | 3, 878 | 4, 800 | 1, 241 | 7, 261 | 8, 502 |
| 5 | Post Office Department | | 4, 082 | 310, 713 | 314, 795 | 4, 075 | 312, 920 | 316, 995 | 4, 181 | 312, 078 | 316, 259 |
| 6 | Department of the Navy | | 7, 213 | 43, 962 | 51, 175 | 6, 927 | 40, 769 | 47, 696 | 6, 412 | 42, 370 | 48, 782 |
| 7 | Department of the Interior | | 3, 562 | 13, 010 | 16, 572 | 3, 606 | 14, 967 | 18, 573 | 3, 168 | 16, 609 | 19, 777 |
| 8 | Department of Agriculture | | 5, 059 | 18, 936 | 23, 995 | 5, 255 | 20, 481 | 25, 736 | 5, 712 | 22, 463 | 28, 175 |
| 9 | Department of Commerce | | 5, 064 | 11, 680 | 16, 744 | 9, 418 | 17, 537 | 26, 955 | 10, 488 | 13, 192 | 23, 680 |
| 10 | Department of Labor | | 718 | 3, 832 | 4, 550 | 774 | 4, 166 | 4, 940 | 817 | 4, 595 | 5, 412 |
| 11 | Government Printing Office | | 4, 187 | | 4, 187 | 4, 419 | | 4, 419 | 4, 894 | | 4, 894 |
| 12 | Smithsonian Institution | | 564 | | 564 | 550 | | 550 | 589 | | 589 |
| 13 | Interstate Commerce Commission | | 1, 410 | 632 | 2, 042 | 1, 531 | 721 | 2, 252 | 1, 614 | 796 | 2, 410 |
| 14 | Civil Service Commission | | 375 | 208 | 583 | 395 | 166 | 561 | 425 | 206 | 631 |
| 15 | U. S. Bureau of Efficiency | | 59 | | 59 | 46 | | 46 | 45 | | 45 |
| 16 | Federal Trade Commission | | 380 | | 380 | 411 | 39 | 450 | 505 | 42 | 547 |
| 17 | U. S. Shipping Board | | 748 | 660 | 1, 408 | 722 | 513 | 1, 235 | 696 | 369 | 1, 065 |
| 18 | U. S. Railroad Administration | | 21 | | 21 | 15 | | 15 | 12 | | 12 |
| 19 | U. S. Food Administration | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | U. S. Fuel Administration | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | Council of National Defense | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | War Industries Board | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | War Trade Board | | | | | | | | | | |

Footnotes at end of table.

Number of employees in the executive service—Continued

| Government establishments | June 30, 1929 | | | June 30, 1930 | | | June 30, 1931 | | |
|------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|---------|----------------------|---------|---------|----------------------|---------|---------|
| | District of Columbia | Field | Total | District of Columbia | Field | Total | District of Columbia | Field | Total |
| 24 Allen Property Custodian..... | 184 | | 184 | 180 | | 180 | 141 | | 141 |
| 25 U. S. Tariff Commission..... | 218 | 11 | 229 | 210 | 10 | 220 | 254 | 65 | 319 |
| 26 Employees' Compensation Commission..... | 116 | 61 | 177 | 118 | 61 | 179 | 120 | 63 | 183 |
| 27 U. S. Federal Board for Vocational Education..... | 70 | | 70 | 87 | | 87 | 83 | | 83 |
| 28 The Panama Canal..... | 76 | 12,021 | 12,097 | 78 | 14,621 | 14,699 | 79 | 10,244 | 10,323 |
| 29 Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board..... | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 Public Buildings and Public Parks..... | 2,425 | | 2,425 | 2,653 | | 2,653 | 2,994 | | 2,994 |
| 31 General Accounting Office..... | 1,961 | | 1,961 | 1,970 | | 1,970 | 1,988 | | 1,988 |
| 32 Veterans' Administration..... | 4,871 | 19,194 | 24,065 | 4,755 | 19,964 | 24,719 | 5,769 | 22,876 | 28,645 |
| 33 Commission of Fine Arts..... | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 3 | | 3 |
| 34 War Finance Corporation..... | 14 | 4 | 18 | 13 | | 13 | 9 | | 9 |
| 35 National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics..... | 35 | 184 | 219 | 40 | 214 | 254 | 43 | 243 | 291 |
| 36 Federal Reserve Board..... | 176 | 19 | 195 | 187 | 18 | 205 | 180 | 19 | 199 |
| 37 Board of Tax Appeals..... | 150 | | 150 | 150 | | 150 | 151 | | 151 |
| 38 Board of Mediation..... | 31 | | 31 | 28 | | 28 | 26 | | 26 |
| 39 Federal Power Commission..... | 29 | 1 | 30 | 36 | 2 | 38 | 47 | 3 | 50 |
| 40 Federal Radio Commission..... | 92 | | 92 | 97 | | 97 | 132 | | 132 |
| 41 American Battle Monuments Commission..... | 8 | 32 | 40 | 9 | 33 | 42 | 8 | 33 | 41 |
| 42 Federal Farm Board..... | | | | 228 | 3 | 231 | 290 | 25 | 315 |
| 43 Personnel Classification Board..... | | | | | | | 62 | | 62 |
| 44 Railroad Labor Board..... | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 Miscellaneous boards and commissions..... | | | | | | | | | |
| Total..... | 63,904 | 523,761 | | 68,510 | 540,405 | | 71,603 | 545,144 | |
| Grand total..... | | | 587,665 | | | 608,915 | | | 616,837 |

Percentage of increase, 1920 over 1913, 43 per cent.
 Percentage of increase, 1920 over 1916, 39 per cent.
 Percentage of decrease, 1920 over 1918, 9.4 per cent.

¹ Including about 200 judges and employees of the courts of the District of Columbia.

² Approximate.

³ Does not include 1,600 employees in the Washington post office for each date.

⁴ In addition to the above number of civilians there were approximately the following numbers of naval reservists and Marine Corps reservists engaged on work ordinarily performed by civilians: In the District of Columbia, 6,025; field service, 10,000.

⁵ These figures include only the employees on the "gold roll," and do not include the "silver roll" employees, who are mostly alien laborers.

⁶ Out of existence July 1, 1919.

⁷ Not reported.

TABLE F.—Cash expenditures of the Government for the fiscal years 1917 to 1931, inclusive, as published in daily Treasury statements, classified according to departments and establishments

[Because of legislation establishing revolving funds and providing for the reimbursement of appropriations, commented upon in the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1919, p. 126 ff., the gross expenditures in the case of some departments and agencies, notably the War Department, the Railroad Administration, and the Shipping Board, have been considerably larger than here stated. This statement does not include expenditures on account of the Postal Service other than salaries and expenses of the Post Office Department in Washington, postal deficiencies, and items appropriated by Congress payable from the general fund of the Treasury]

| | 1917 (revised) | 1918 | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| General expenditures: ORDINARY¹ | | | | | |
| Legislative establishment ² | \$15,092,373.97 | \$15,825,506.72 | \$17,090,106.24 | \$19,327,708.72 | \$18,982,565.17 |
| Executive proper ³ | 1,280,484.85 | 9,062,847.53 | 17,467,352.03 | 6,675,517.58 | 210,056.79 |
| State Department..... | 6,169,316.41 | 9,892,898.09 | 20,766,400.14 | 13,586,024.42 | 8,780,796.84 |
| Treasury Department..... | 84,294,313.65 | 152,500,426.53 | 227,277,657.81 | 322,315,627.43 | 488,636,833.10 |
| War Department..... | 358,158,361.12 | 4,850,687,186.88 | 8,995,880,266.18 | 1,610,587,380.86 | 1,101,615,013.32 |
| Department of Justice..... | 10,566,401.25 | 12,964,628.18 | 15,717,022.36 | 17,814,398.18 | 17,206,418.08 |
| Post Office Department..... | 1,895,578.21 | 4,173,103.28 | 2,412,250.05 | 50,049,295.07 | ⁴ 135,359,108.17 |
| Navy Department..... | 239,632,756.63 | 1,278,840,486.80 | 2,002,310,785.02 | 736,021,456.43 | 650,373,835.58 |
| Interior Department..... | 216,415,516.48 | 244,555,893.96 | 288,285,627.61 | 279,244,660.87 | 357,814,893.01 |
| Department of Agriculture..... | 29,547,234.01 | 42,870,188.28 | 39,246,454.41 | 65,546,293.14 | 119,837,759.41 |
| Department of Commerce..... | 11,689,792.94 | 12,833,808.82 | 15,589,514.30 | 30,010,737.75 | 30,828,761.55 |
| Department of Labor..... | 3,852,111.34 | 5,469,288.09 | 12,942,558.75 | 5,415,358.40 | 8,502,509.55 |
| Independent offices and commissions ⁵ | 7,558,829.88 | 12,714,740.05 | 75,375,809.41 | 59,469,305.17 | 119,942,516.73 |
| District of Columbia..... | 13,681,565.39 | 14,446,832.46 | 16,014,105.80 | 19,987,898.41 | 22,715,158.60 |
| Total..... | 999,834,666.13 | 6,667,438,815.08 | 11,746,375,910.11 | 3,236,051,662.43 | 3,080,806,225.85 |
| Deduct unclassified items..... | ⁶ 150,275.43 | ⁶ 26,469,620.31 | ⁶ 895,060.84 | 4,399,847.00 | 922,593.14 |
| Total..... | 999,684,390.70 | 6,693,908,435.39 | 11,747,270,970.95 | 3,231,651,815.43 | 3,079,883,632.71 |
| Interest on public debt..... | 24,742,701.68 | 189,743,277.14 | 619,215,569.17 | 1,020,251,622.28 | 999,144,731.35 |
| Panama Canal..... | 19,782,509.32 | 19,208,099.30 | 13,195,522.37 | 11,365,714.01 | 16,461,409.47 |
| Payment for West Indian Islands..... | 25,000,000.00 | | | | |
| Operations in special accounts: | | | | | |
| Railroads..... | | 120,263,996.17 | 358,795,274.60 | ⁷ 1,036,672,157.53 | ⁸ 730,711,699.98 |
| War Finance Corporation..... | | 44,929,168.38 | 302,621,846.92 | ⁹ 228,472,186.61 | ¹⁰ 22,028,452.12 |
| Shipping Board..... | 14,291,282.96 | 770,681,550.83 | 1,820,606,870.90 | 530,565,649.61 | 130,723,268.25 |
| Grain Corporation..... | | | | ¹¹ 350,328,494.70 | ¹² 90,353,411.42 |
| Food and Fuel Administrations..... | | 54,859,896.40 | 87,338,207.08 | | |
| Purchase of obligations of foreign governments..... | 885,000,000.00 | 4,738,029,750.00 | 3,479,255,265.56 | 421,337,028.09 | 73,896,697.44 |
| Purchase of Federal farm loan bonds..... | | 65,018,296.93 | 86,580,427.48 | 29,643,546.17 | 16,781,320.79 |
| Subscription to stock, Federal land banks..... | 8,880,315.00 | | | | |
| Total ordinary..... | 1,977,681,750.52 | 12,696,702,471.14 | 18,514,879,955.03 | 6,403,343,841.21 | 5,115,927,689.30 |
| Public debt retirements chargeable against ordinary receipts: | | | | | |
| Sinking fund..... | | | | | 261,100,250.00 |
| Purchases from foreign repayments..... | | | 7,921,700.00 | 72,669,900.00 | 73,939,300.00 |
| Received for estate taxes..... | | | 93,050.00 | 3,141,050.00 | 26,345,950.00 |
| Purchases from franchise tax receipts (Federal reserve banks)..... | | 1,134,234.48 | | 2,922,450.00 | 60,724,500.00 |
| Forfeitures, gifts, etc..... | | | | 12,950.00 | 168,500.00 |
| Total..... | | 1,134,234.48 | 8,014,750.00 | 78,746,350.00 | 422,281,500.00 |
| Total expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts..... | 1,977,681,750.52 | 12,697,836,705.62 | 18,522,894,705.03 | 6,482,090,191.21 | 5,538,209,189.30 |
| PUBLIC DEBT | | | | | |
| Public debt retirements chargeable against ordinary receipts (see above)..... | | 1,134,234.48 | 8,014,750.00 | 78,746,350.00 | 422,281,500.00 |
| Other public debt expenditures..... | 677,544,782.25 | 7,213,555,218.81 | 16,318,491,810.41 | 16,959,293,373.62 | 8,759,745,670.69 |
| Total public debt..... | 677,544,782.25 | 7,214,689,453.29 | 16,326,506,560.41 | 17,038,039,723.62 | 9,182,027,170.69 |

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE F.—Cash expenditures of the Government for the fiscal years 1917 to 1931, inclusive, as published in daily Treasury statements, classified according to departments and establishments—Continued

| | 1917 (revised) | 1918 | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Recapitulation: | | | | | |
| Certificates of indebtedness..... | \$632,572,263.00 | \$7,086,312,732.00 | \$15,538,078,900.00 | \$15,589,117,458.53 | \$8,552,225,500.00 |
| Treasury notes..... | ¹⁰ 4,390,000.00 | ¹⁰ 27,362,000.00 | ¹⁰ 19,150,000.00 | | |
| War savings securities..... | | 2,727,345.96 | 131,519,529.91 | 200,982,934.62 | 160,256,308.19 |
| First Liberty bonds..... | | 656,000.00 | 4,003,050.00 | 82,336,700.00 | 202,650.00 |
| Second Liberty bonds..... | | 61,050,000.00 | 180,351,000.00 | 241,144,200.00 | 8,703,400.00 |
| Third Liberty bonds..... | | 14,835,509.00 | 201,655,700.00 | 296,300,800.00 | 51,172,350.00 |
| Fourth Liberty bonds..... | | | 165,000,000.00 | 405,222,800.00 | 39,414,450.00 |
| Victory notes..... | | | | 249,001,500.00 | 332,439,450.00 |
| Other debt items..... | 18,393.75 | 20,650.83 | 63,029,583.00 | 509,165.97 | 152,361.50 |
| National bank notes and Federal reserve bank notes..... | 40,564,115.50 | 21,625,225.00 | 23,718,797.50 | 23,424,164.50 | 37,460,701.00 |
| Total public debt..... | 677,544,782.25 | 7,214,689,453.29 | 16,326,506,560.41 | 17,038,039,723.62 | 9,182,027,170.69 |

¹ The figures given for operations in special accounts are net figures and make allowance for receipts and deposits credited to the account concerned.

² In the fiscal years 1921, 1922, and 1923, changes were made in classification of expenditures between legislative establishment, executive proper, and other independent offices and commissions, which account for most of the differences as compared with expenditures for other fiscal years.

³ Owing to settlement between the Post Office Department and the Railroad Administration on account of transportation during Federal control, Post Office Department expenditures for June, 1921, include \$65,575,832.03 paid to the Railroad Administration. Deposit of this payment by Railroad Administration resulted in decrease in expenditures on account of "Federal control of transportation systems and transportation act, 1920," by a corresponding amount.

⁴ Payments on account of veterans' relief made prior to Aug. 11, 1921, by the War Risk Insurance Bureau are included under Treasury Department, while similar payments made prior to that date by the Federal Board for Vocational Education are included under other independent offices and commissions. During the fiscal year 1922 allotments for veterans' relief have been made to the Treasury Department in the amount of \$26,350,688.66, to the War Department in the amount of \$4,866,383.40, and to the Navy Department in the amount of \$529,237.84, but expenditures under these allotments appear as expenditures of the respective departments and not of the Veterans' Bureau.

⁵ Allotments for veterans' relief have been made as follows: 1923—Treasury Department, \$3,164,425.11; War Department, \$4,889,241.91; Navy Department, \$2,632,303.1924—Treasury Department, \$457,150; War Department, \$4,434,713.92; Navy Department, \$1,474,600; Interior Department, \$44,791; 1925—Treasury Department, \$394,840; War Department, \$4,075,300.07; Navy Department, \$1,536,800; and Interior Department, \$51,250.

⁶ Add.

⁷ Included under Treasury Department prior to fiscal year 1922.

⁸ Included under Post Office Department prior to fiscal year 1922.

⁹ Includes \$288,399,222.46 payments on certificates of indebtedness of Director General of Railroads, due July 15, 1919.

¹⁰ Deduct excess of credits.

¹¹ The railroad expenditures during the fiscal year 1922 were reduced by \$266,636,606.26, on account of deposits by the Railroad Administration, representing proceeds of sale of equipment trust notes acquired under the Federal control act approved Mar. 21, 1918, as amended, and the act approved Nov. 19, 1919, and were further reduced by \$123,783,487.75, on account of deposits of the proceeds of sale or collection of other securities acquired under the Federal control act or transportation act, 1920. In 1923 and 1924 receipts on these accounts were included in the daily Treasury statement under miscellaneous receipts, proceeds of Government-owned securities, railroad securities.

¹² Deduct excess of credits resulting from deposits of War Finance Corporation representing proceeds of redemptions of its holdings of United States securities. (See note 2, p. 2, daily Treasury statement for June 30, 1920.)

¹³ Included under Executive proper prior to fiscal year 1922.

¹⁴ Includes \$350,000,000 applied by United States Grain Corporation to reduction of capital stock and reflected in "Miscellaneous receipts for fiscal year 1920." (See note 1, p. 2, daily Treasury statement for June 30, 1920.)

¹⁵ Net expenditures after taking into account credits and \$100,000,000 applied to reduction in capital stock of United States Grain Corporation.

¹⁶ \$25,000,000 of this amount represents reduction in capital stock of United States Grain Corporation effected Oct. 17, 1921, and is reflected in an increase of receipts in an equal amount. (See note, p. 2, daily Treasury statement for Oct. 18, 1921.)

¹⁷ Established by act of May 22, 1920, and included under Interior Department prior to fiscal year 1922.

¹⁸ Included under District of Columbia prior to fiscal year 1922.

¹⁹ One-year Treasury notes issued under sec. 18, Federal reserve act.

²⁰ Owing to settlement between the Post Office Department and the Railroad Administration on account of transportation during Federal control, Post Office Department expenditures for June, 1921, include \$65,575,832.03 paid to the Railroad Administration. Deposit of this payment by Railroad Administration resulted in decrease in expenditures on account of "Federal control of transportation systems and transportation act, 1920," by a corresponding amount.

TABLE 5.—Ordinary receipts, expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts, and surplus or deficit for the fiscal years 1922 to 1931¹

Beginning with the fiscal year 1931, receipts and expenditures were classified according to general, special, and trust funds in the daily Treasury statement in order to conform to the practice of the Bureau of the Budget. In the following table, however, transactions in general, special, and trust funds are combined for purposes of historical comparison. For explanation of funds, see p. 424.

Because of legislation establishing revolving funds and providing for the reimbursement of appropriations, commented upon in the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1919, p. 125 ff., the gross expenditures in the case of some departments and agencies, notably the War Department, the Railroad Administration, and the Shipping Board, have been considerably larger than here stated. Postal expenditures in this statement include postal deficiencies; items appropriated by Congress payable from the general fund of the Treasury; and, up to and including the fiscal year 1922, salaries and expenses of the Post Office Department in Washington.

| | 1922 | 1923 | 1924 | 1925 | 1926 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| ORDINARY RECEIPTS | | | | | |
| Customs (including tonnage tax)..... | \$356,443,387.18 | \$561,928,866.66 | \$545,637,503.99 | \$547,561,226.11 | \$579,430,092.86 |
| Income and profits taxes..... | 2,068,128,192.68 | 1,678,607,428.22 | 1,842,144,418.46 | 1,760,537,823.68 | 1,982,040,088.58 |
| Miscellaneous internal revenue..... | 1,145,126,064.11 | 945,865,332.61 | 953,012,617.62 | 828,638,067.90 | 855,599,289.26 |
| Miscellaneous revenue, including Panama Canal..... | 539,407,506.97 | 820,733,853.07 | 671,250,161.58 | 643,411,566.73 | 645,686,219.44 |
| Total ordinary receipts..... | 4,109,104,150.94 | 4,007,135,480.56 | 4,012,044,701.65 | 3,780,148,684.42 | 3,962,755,690.14 |
| ORDINARY EXPENDITURES | | | | | |
| General expenditures: | | | | | |
| Legislative establishments ¹ | 17,088,112.87 | 14,165,243.89 | 14,315,684.73 | 13,855,664.29 | 15,776,230.41 |
| Executive Office ² | 218,690.36 | 349,380.15 | 450,952.65 | 411,893.27 | 438,768.06 |
| State Department..... | 9,666,571.70 | 15,463,276.30 | 14,669,456.89 | 15,054,408.58 | 16,521,348.08 |
| Treasury Department..... | 209,104,990.87 | 145,016,859.60 | 137,411,205.17 | 128,232,421.79 | 136,578,723.67 |
| War Department..... | 454,730,717.67 | 392,733,634.86 | 348,629,778.55 | 361,887,888.84 | 355,072,225.92 |
| Department of Justice..... | 17,888,828.58 | 23,521,485.79 | 21,134,228.10 | 23,465,738.96 | 23,774,129.23 |
| Post Office Department..... | 3,384,127.31 | 146,942.45 | 186,789.29 | ¹¹ 79,826.85 | 96,388.93 |
| Navy Department..... | 476,775,193.84 | 333,201,302.31 | 332,249,136.67 | 346,142,001.44 | 312,743,409.81 |
| Interior Department..... | 331,814,027.57 | 354,623,058.88 | 325,227,697.11 | 302,440,633.08 | 301,759,049.28 |
| Department of Agriculture..... | 142,695,844.10 | 128,745,677.33 | 141,116,440.69 | 164,644,283.54 | 155,850,432.49 |
| Department of Commerce..... | 21,688,014.86 | 21,763,508.71 | 21,429,678.93 | 25,782,961.39 | 29,132,015.82 |
| Department of Labor..... | 6,227,471.57 | 7,241,496.73 | 6,620,052.55 | 9,677,841.30 | 8,544,899.59 |
| Veterans' Bureau ³ | ³ 376,749,664.29 | ⁴ 461,719,433.83 | ⁴ 409,120,803.66 | ⁴ 384,715,796.72 | 404,692,185.22 |
| Other independent offices and commissions ⁵ | 43,871,656.40 | 28,712,285.42 | 28,261,981.47 | 27,682,657.28 | 32,069,356.30 |
| District of Columbia..... | 23,731,562.56 | 24,063,705.47 | 25,873,115.19 | 32,713,000.57 | 34,410,707.45 |
| Total..... | 2,135,635,474.55 | 1,951,477,321.73 | 1,829,697,061.65 | 1,836,657,369.20 | 1,826,950,870.26 |
| Deduct unclassified items..... | ⁶ 232,088.59 | 1,436,386.81 | 1,234,150.47 | ⁷ 347,106.72 | 232,946.52 |
| Total general expenditures..... | 2,135,867,563.14 | 1,950,040,934.92 | 1,828,462,911.18 | 1,837,004,475.92 | 1,826,726,923.74 |
| Interest on public debt..... | 991,000,759.24 | 1,055,923,689.61 | 940,602,912.92 | 881,806,662.36 | 831,937,700.16 |
| Refunds of receipts: | | | | | |
| Customs ⁸ | 37,124,086.84 | 28,736,711.58 | 20,566,638.33 | 22,920,891.05 | 27,744,697.87 |
| Internal revenue ⁹ | 45,702,272.89 | 125,279,043.35 | 127,220,151.47 | 147,777,034.05 | 182,220,053.01 |
| Postal deficiency ¹⁰ | 64,346,234.52 | 32,526,914.89 | 12,638,849.75 | 23,216,783.58 | 39,506,490.29 |
| Panama Canal..... | 3,025,421.32 | 4,316,961.30 | 8,387,099.90 | 9,092,818.69 | 9,017,719.60 |

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 5.—Ordinary receipts, expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts, and surplus or deficit for the fiscal years 1922 to 1931—Continued

| | 1922 | 1923 | 1924 | 1925 | 1926 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| ORDINARY EXPENDITURES—continued | | | | | |
| Operations in special accounts: [†] | | | | | |
| Railroads..... | [†] \$139,469,450.82 | \$114,144,654.12 | \$35,742,167.74 | \$7,204,992.53 | \$2,725,800.85 |
| War Finance Corporation..... | 94,428,001.01 | 109,436,238.13 | 52,539,947.20 | 42,901,758.13 | 19,691,166.28 |
| Shipping Board..... | 87,205,732.12 | 57,023,838.18 | 85,491,358.71 | 30,304,859.54 | 23,043,032.04 |
| Alien-property funds [‡] | 1,825,643.90 | 1,385,554.16 | 1,150,576.16 | 4,018,131.55 | 3,515,999.58 |
| Grain Corporation..... | 12,32,000,000.00 | 2,482,476.33 | | | 120,152,238.11 |
| Sugar Equalization Board..... | [†] 15,279,636.52 | | | 99,458,769.16 | 10,815,743.02 |
| Purchase of obligations of foreign governments..... | 717,834.36 | 8,091,417.48 | 8,028,339.62 | 9,745,022.04 | 38,290,345.65 |
| Purchase of Federal farm-loan bonds..... | | 26,672,161.78 | 30,410,378.80 | 31,991,713.82 | 297,036.87 |
| Civil-service retirement fund [§] | 9,283,138.54 | 190,517.91 | 233,420.36 | 258,005.70 | 297,036.87 |
| Investment of trust funds: | | | | | |
| Government life-insurance fund [¶] | 24,599,340.52 | | | 82,568.91 | 100,033.44 |
| District of Columbia teachers' retirement fund | 230,958.69 | | 4,584,262.92 | 1,123,700.49 | 1,209,175.55 |
| Total ordinary expenditures..... | 3,372,607,899.84 | 3,294,627,529.16 | 3,048,677,965.34 | 3,063,105,332.26 | 3,097,611,822.81 |
| PUBLIC DEBT RETIREMENTS CHARGEABLE AGAINST ORDINARY RECEIPTS | | | | | |
| Sinking fund..... | 276,046,000.00 | 284,018,800.00 | 295,987,350.00 | 306,308,400.00 | 317,091,750.00 |
| Purchases from foreign repayments..... | 64,837,900.00 | 22,140,000.00 | 38,509,150.00 | 386,100.00 | 4,393,500.00 |
| Received from foreign governments under debt settlements..... | | 68,732,950.00 | 110,878,450.00 | 158,793,500.00 | 165,260,000.00 |
| Received for estate taxes..... | 21,084,850.00 | 6,568,550.00 | 8,897,050.00 | 47,550.00 | |
| Purchases from franchise-tax receipts (Federal reserve and Federal intermediate credit banks)..... | 60,333,000.00 | 10,815,300.00 | 3,634,550.00 | 794,159.88 | 567,900.69 |
| Forfeitures, gifts, etc..... | 392,850.00 | 554,891.10 | 93,200.00 | 208,403.95 | 62,900.00 |
| Total public-debt retirements chargeable against ordinary receipts..... | 422,694,600.00 | 402,850,491.10 | 457,999,750.00 | 466,538,113.83 | 487,376,050.69 |
| Total expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts..... | 3,795,302,499.84 | 3,697,478,020.26 | 3,506,677,715.34 | 3,529,643,446.09 | 3,584,987,873.50 |
| Surplus (+) or deficit (—)..... | +313,801,651.10 | +309,657,460.30 | +505,366,986.31 | +250,505,238.33 | +377,767,816.64 |
| ORDINARY RECEIPTS | | | | | |
| Customs (including tonnage tax)..... | \$805,499,983.44 | \$568,986,188.50 | \$602,262,786.17 | \$587,000,903.25 | \$378,354,005.35 |
| Income and profits taxes..... | 2,224,992,800.25 | 2,173,952,556.73 | 2,330,711,822.66 | 2,410,986,977.53 | 1,860,394,295.25 |
| Miscellaneous internal revenue..... | 644,421,541.56 | 621,018,665.64 | 607,807,548.98 | 628,308,035.85 | 569,886,721.07 |
| Miscellaneous revenue, including Panama Canal..... | 654,480,115.85 | 678,390,745.32 | 492,968,067.24 | 551,645,785.36 | 509,098,472.14 |
| Total ordinary receipts..... | 4,129,394,441.10 | 4,042,348,156.19 | 4,033,250,225.05 | 4,177,941,701.99 | 3,817,233,493.81 |
| ORDINARY EXPENDITURES | | | | | |
| General expenditures: | | | | | |
| Legislative establishment [†] | 19,678,325.13 | 16,402,048.28 | 17,546,655.67 | 19,986,820.64 | 23,978,412.68 |
| Executive Office [‡] | 612,197.93 | 589,497.19 | 487,250.03 | 690,263.00 | 506,811.30 |
| State Department..... | 16,497,698.60 | 11,607,071.23 | 13,284,510.33 | 14,170,408.87 | 15,687,716.33 |
| Treasury Department..... | 151,560,333.78 | 195,648,941.27 | 200,447,224.41 | 193,114,012.63 | 204,569,134.17 |
| War Department..... | 390,808,776.71 | 390,540,805.49 | 416,901,545.42 | 453,524,973.41 | 478,418,974.37 |
| Department of Justice..... | 24,819,057.70 | 27,600,254.81 | 28,891,620.32 | 32,483,080.31 | 44,333,497.73 |
| Post Office Department..... | 189,037.77 | 276,692.81 | [†] 43,090,870.27 | 58,198.91 | 82,297.59 |
| Navy Department..... | 318,909,096.23 | 331,335,491.98 | 364,561,543.99 | 374,165,638.55 | 354,071,004.10 |
| Interior Department..... | 302,706,745.19 | 298,999,534.09 | 301,122,596.27 | 290,027,905.76 | 71,500,359.20 |
| Department of Agriculture..... | 156,287,304.95 | 159,914,696.27 | 171,147,262.58 | 177,580,581.10 | 296,865,944.69 |
| Department of Commerce..... | 30,939,749.02 | 34,383,165.32 | 39,987,346.45 | 54,299,105.12 | 61,477,117.63 |
| Department of Labor..... | 9,921,644.26 | 9,821,480.97 | 11,311,190.36 | 12,181,885.62 | 12,181,885.62 |
| Veterans' Bureau..... | 391,470,413.72 | 401,324,833.17 | 417,280,404.40 | 446,955,630.33 | 729,190,248.12 |
| Other independent offices and commissions [†] | 35,442,771.15 | 35,681,462.45 | 40,308,719.63 | 49,496,746.47 | 49,969,046.05 |
| District of Columbia..... | 37,566,520.57 | 39,399,622.44 | 40,118,588.38 | 45,079,613.67 | 47,798,065.62 |
| Total..... | 1,857,409,642.76 | 1,953,525,595.77 | 2,106,485,327.51 | 2,162,286,385.40 | 2,390,639,515.21 |
| Deduct unclassified items..... | [†] 448,920.63 | 198,554.39 | [†] 17,803.40 | [†] 422,550.04 | 162,238.35 |
| Total general expenditures..... | 1,857,858,563.39 | 1,953,724,150.16 | 2,106,503,130.91 | 2,162,708,935.44 | 2,390,801,753.56 |
| Interest on public debt..... | 787,019,578.18 | 731,764,476.30 | 678,330,399.50 | 659,347,613.07 | 611,559,704.35 |
| Refund of receipts: | | | | | |
| Customs [¶] | 20,320,524.37 | 21,856,901.13 | 21,826,435.69 | 24,091,809.24 | 21,369,006.78 |
| Internal revenue [¶] | 117,412,172.61 | 148,286,060.13 | 190,727,887.12 | 133,852,182.70 | 69,887,928.92 |
| Postal deficiency [¶] | 27,263,191.12 | 32,080,202.46 | [†] 94,699,744.06 | 91,714,450.89 | 145,643,613.12 |
| Panama Canal..... | 8,306,345.04 | 10,448,879.83 | 9,045,647.29 | 11,328,541.69 | 9,299,056.81 |
| Operations in special accounts: [†] | | | | | |
| Railroads..... | 1,042,746.21 | [†] 619,721.67 | [†] 1,857,633.06 | [†] 4,795,787.55 | [†] 245,609.87 |
| War Finance Corporation..... | [†] 27,065,781.61 | [†] 3,813,040.77 | [†] 611,414.95 | [†] 58,838.54 | 172,153.82 |
| Shipping Board..... | 19,011,397.11 | 34,881,713.16 | 15,889,059.12 | 31,695,169.06 | 33,961,996.34 |
| Agricultural marketing fund (net)..... | | | | 149,958,273.55 | 190,540,854.70 |
| Alien-property funds [‡] | [†] 496,117.92 | [†] 351,151.52 | [†] 1,345,327.26 | 968,985.50 | 1,185,835.92 |
| Adjusted service-certificate fund..... | 115,219,352.30 | 111,817,839.69 | 111,772,809.62 | 112,312,726.75 | 224,216,285.58 |
| Civil-service retirement fund [§] | [†] 425,194.65 | 109,272.28 | 19,955,190.64 | 20,433,867.39 | 20,304,247.73 |
| Investment of trust funds: | | | | | |
| Government life-insurance fund [¶] | 47,315,972.70 | 61,701,568.44 | 52,160,111.83 | 43,469,104.81 | 59,626,371.43 |
| District of Columbia teachers' retirement fund | 289,980.43 | 513,917.75 | 503,158.37 | 516,706.13 | 570,581.99 |
| Foreign Service retirement..... | 87,267.50 | 80,938.85 | 282,444.12 | 313,282.13 | 336,930.15 |
| General railroad contingent..... | 870,767.84 | 1,179,957.39 | 677,642.83 | 2,411,871.58 | 962,104.25 |
| Total ordinary expenditures..... | 2,974,029,674.62 | 3,103,264,854.83 | 3,298,859,485.88 | 3,440,268,883.84 | 3,779,868,338.88 |
| PUBLIC DEBT RETIREMENTS CHARGEABLE AGAINST ORDINARY RECEIPTS | | | | | |
| Sinking fund..... | 333,528,400.00 | 354,741,300.00 | 370,277,100.00 | 388,368,950.00 | 391,660,000.00 |
| Purchases from foreign repayments..... | 19,254,500.00 | 19,088,000.00 | 571,150.00 | 51,135,000.00 | 48,245,950.00 |
| Received from foreign governments under debt settlements..... | 159,961,800.00 | 162,736,050.00 | 175,642,350.00 | 109,790,850.00 | |
| Received for estate taxes..... | | 1,500.00 | 20,000.00 | 73,100.00 | |
| Purchases from franchise tax receipts (Federal reserve and Federal intermediate credit banks)..... | 1,231,834.78 | 618,367.05 | 2,933,400.00 | 4,455,000.00 | 91,400.00 |

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 5.—Ordinary receipts, expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts, and surplus or deficit for the fiscal years 1922 to 1931—Continued

| | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| PUBLIC DEBT RETIREMENTS CHARGEABLE AGAINST ORDINARY RECEIPTS—continued | | | | | |
| Forfeitures, gifts, etc. | \$5,578,310.00 | \$3,089,803.25 | \$159,703.75 | \$90,703.25 | \$84,650.00 |
| Total public debt retirements chargeable against ordinary receipts | 519,554,844.78 | 540,255,020.30 | 549,603,703.75 | 553,883,603.25 | 440,082,000.00 |
| Total expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts | 3,493,584,519.40 | 3,643,519,875.13 | 3,848,463,189.63 | 3,994,152,487.09 | 4,219,950,338.88 |
| Surplus (+) or deficit (—) | +635,809,921.70 | +398,828,281.06 | +184,787,035.42 | +183,789,214.90 | —16,902,716,845.07 |

¹ Figures for ordinary receipts and ordinary expenditures from Apr. 6, 1917, to June 30, 1917, are available on p. 444 of 1926 report; and for the fiscal years 1916 to 1919² on p. 489 of the 1930 report.

² In the fiscal years 1921, 1922, and 1923, changes were made in classification of expenditures between Legislative Establishment, Executive Office, and other independent offices and commissions, which account for most of the differences as compared with expenditures for other fiscal years.

³ Payments on account of veterans' relief made prior to Aug. 11, 1921, by the War Risk Insurance Bureau are included under Treasury Department, while similar payments made prior to that date by the Federal Board of Vocational Education are included under other independent offices and commissions. During the fiscal year 1922 allotments for veterans' relief were made to the Treasury Department in the amount of \$26,350,668.66, to the War Department in the amount of \$4,566,383.40, and to the Navy Department in the amount of \$529,237.84, but expenditures under these allotments appear as expenditures of the respective departments and not of the Veterans' Bureau.

⁴ Allotments for veterans' relief were made as follows: 1923—Treasury Department, \$3,164,425.11; War Department, \$4,889,211.91; Navy Department, \$2,652,303. 1924—Treasury Department, \$457,150; War Department, \$4,434,713.92; Navy Department, \$1,474,600; Interior Department, \$44,791. 1925—Treasury Department, \$394,840; War Department, \$4,075,300.07; Navy Department, \$1,536,800; and Interior Department, \$51,250.

⁵ Add.

⁶ Included under Treasury Department prior to fiscal year 1922.

⁷ Included under Post Office Department prior to fiscal year 1922.

⁸ The figures given for operations in special accounts are net figures and make allowance for receipts and deposits credited to the account concerned.

⁹ Deduct, excess of credits.

¹⁰ The railroad expenditures during the fiscal year 1922 were reduced by \$296,636,006.23, on account of deposits by the Railroad Administration, representing proceeds of sale of equipment trust notes acquired under the Federal control act approved Mar. 21, 1918, as amended, and the act approved Nov. 19, 1919, and were further reduced by \$123,783,487.75 on account of deposits of the proceeds of sale or collection of other securities acquired under the Federal control act or transportation act, 1920. In 1923 and 1924 receipts on these accounts were included in the daily Treasury statement under miscellaneous receipts, proceeds of Government-owned securities, railroad securities.

¹¹ Included under Executive Office prior to fiscal year 1922.

¹² \$25,000,000 of this amount represents reduction in capital stock of United States Grain Corporation effected Oct. 17, 1921, and is reflected in an increase of receipts an equal amount. (See note, p. 2, daily Treasury statement for Oct. 18, 1921.)

¹³ Established by act of May 22, 1920, and included under Interior Department prior to fiscal year 1922.

¹⁴ Included under District of Columbia prior to fiscal year 1922.

¹⁵ Included in expenditures of Post Office Department and also on account of postal deficiency for the fiscal year 1929 (month of June, 1929) are \$42,997,039.50 and \$8,999,993, respectively, representing payment of so-called back railway mail pay to inland carriers under authority of joint resolution approved June 6, 1929.

¹⁶ For deficit exclusive of trust fund transactions see p. 26.

Appropriations, by organization units, for the fiscal years 1910 to 1913, inclusive

| | 1910 | 1911 | 1912 | 1913 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Legislative establishment | \$14,345,984.32 | \$13,955,694.86 | \$13,237,362.54 | \$13,165,958.80 |
| Executive Office | 472,044.08 | 970,750.00 | 823,910.00 | 600,076.52 |
| Independent offices | 1,777,501.19 | 2,230,911.97 | 2,863,695.12 | 2,619,094.14 |
| District of Columbia | 10,904,119.24 | 11,085,913.80 | 12,957,123.36 | 11,511,197.10 |
| Department of Agriculture | 13,403,456.42 | 13,577,710.15 | 21,793,430.59 | 22,902,984.26 |
| Department of Commerce and Labor | 12,623,483.56 | 24,550,572.58 | 16,049,925.67 | 15,552,641.90 |
| Department of the Interior | 183,645,587.25 | 199,635,517.87 | 194,063,455.97 | 202,518,734.73 |
| Department of Justice | 9,696,965.19 | 10,524,842.74 | 10,256,185.09 | 10,234,022.89 |
| Navy Department | 140,842,757.36 | 133,936,340.11 | 130,610,218.47 | 126,807,322.58 |
| Post Office Department payable from Treasury | 21,952.97 | 413,345.07 | 607,859.22 | 1,164,095.73 |
| Post Office Department and Postal Service payable from postal revenues | 1,695,708.15 | 1,697,490.00 | 1,642,190.00 | 1,625,479.50 |
| Department of State | 4,664,367.65 | 5,337,957.77 | 4,883,724.14 | 4,223,166.39 |
| Treasury Department | 52,960,865.92 | 40,440,046.86 | 71,978,483.62 | 60,102,884.88 |
| Interest on the public debt | (¹) | (¹) | 21,600,000.00 | 22,775,000.00 |
| Sinking fund and other public-debt retirements chargeable against ordinary receipts | (¹) | (¹) | 61,000,000.00 | 60,650,000.00 |
| War Department | 201,136,882.96 | 205,368,701.06 | 199,747,921.73 | 194,085,943.04 |
| Total | 648,191,676.26 | 663,725,794.84 | 764,125,485.52 | 750,588,602.46 |
| Deduct Post Office Department and Postal Service payable from postal revenues | 1,695,708.15 | 1,697,490.00 | 1,642,190.00 | 1,625,479.50 |
| Total, exclusive of Post Office Department and Postal Service payable from postal revenues | 646,495,968.11 | 662,028,304.84 | 762,483,295.52 | 748,963,122.96 |

¹ The statement of appropriations published for this year did not include the indefinite appropriation provided for the payment of interest on the public debt. The actual expenditures for this purpose during the fiscal years 1910 and 1911 were: 1910, \$21,342,978.83; 1911, \$21,311,334.12.

TABLE 20.—Appropriations for the fiscal years 1914 to 1929, including estimated permanent and indefinite appropriations and deficiencies for prior years¹

| | Third session Sixty-second Congress, fiscal year 1914 | First and second sessions Sixty-third Congress, fiscal year 1915 | Third session Sixty-third Congress, fiscal year 1916 | First session Sixty-fourth Congress, fiscal year 1917 | Second session Sixty-fourth Congress and first session Sixty-fifth Congress, fiscal year 1918 | Second session Sixty-fifth Congress, fiscal year 1919 | Third session Sixty-fifth Congress and first session Sixty-sixth Congress, fiscal year 1920 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Legislative | \$13,964,075.22 | \$14,796,236.92 | \$14,034,240.33 | \$14,540,138.33 | \$16,865,770.34 | \$18,571,305.51 | \$17,637,214.67 |
| Executive office | 210,092.55 | 210,443.59 | 210,440.00 | 213,780.88 | 221,280.00 | 218,780.00 | 221,080.50 |
| Independent offices | 3,089,025.08 | 9,326,517.93 | 7,404,650.55 | 58,395,108.61 | 1,305,307,260.87 | 3,051,158,732.86 | 2,462,238,467.70 |
| District of Columbia | 12,353,403.21 | 13,554,936.43 | 12,893,383.21 | 14,044,332.87 | 15,687,936.43 | 16,936,880.87 | 17,202,938.00 |
| Department of Agriculture | 23,676,425.86 | 27,108,883.11 | 30,942,091.04 | 36,973,191.41 | 66,891,234.79 | 66,420,066.43 | 196,175,393.18 |
| Department of Commerce | 10,329,608.44 | 12,137,881.90 | 11,259,145.37 | 12,452,424.28 | 13,687,424.88 | 15,310,850.71 | 30,679,124.25 |
| Department of the Interior | 239,832,411.16 | 212,077,124.45 | 210,848,789.26 | 210,026,630.56 | 223,294,460.59 | 295,777,748.10 | 271,567,331.13 |
| Department of Justice | 11,005,512.61 | 11,096,176.88 | 10,889,181.32 | 11,662,275.87 | 12,016,477.18 | 14,974,858.98 | 18,376,751.26 |
| Department of Labor | 3,370,545.75 | 4,245,339.64 | 3,466,717.13 | 3,724,781.79 | 6,158,354.46 | 11,609,642.46 | 5,363,895.40 |
| Navy Department | 144,982,547.89 | 150,357,571.24 | 153,097,154.46 | 320,718,084.53 | 1,606,052,674.57 | 1,793,682,080.19 | 910,560,128.78 |
| Post Office Department payable from Treasury ² | 1,929,350.78 | 2,558,633.89 | 1,849,979.56 | 2,007,187.96 | 1,986,719.98 | 1,994,749.57 | ³ 38,068,801.61 |
| Post Office Department and Postal Service payable from postal revenues ⁴ | 286,319,125.26 | 316,777,886.96 | 314,245,638.39 | 326,493,008.82 | 335,696,345.12 | 385,712,029.58 | 412,528,240.12 |
| Department of State | 4,621,908.62 | 6,436,129.07 | 4,906,553.04 | 9,970,633.09 | 31,622,435.33 | 11,359,760.83 | 12,762,191.23 |
| Treasury Department | 64,433,406.41 | 69,694,516.62 | 65,462,815.79 | 80,080,605.15 | 7,336,095,502.27 | 3,418,605,750.54 | 317,690,154.92 |
| Interest on the public debt | 22,860,000.00 | 22,900,000.00 | 22,970,000.00 | 23,300,000.00 | 241,795,323.00 | 655,107,269.00 | 1,052,300,000.00 |
| Sinking fund and other public-debt retirements chargeable against ordinary receipts | 60,685,000.00 | 60,717,000.00 | 60,723,000.00 | 60,727,000.00 | 60,748,000.00 | 288,889,865.00 | (⁵) |
| War Department | 194,939,626.80 | 188,476,640.46 | 189,286,924.64 | 443,082,460.66 | 7,592,813,043.98 | 16,993,818,562.39 | 876,464,936.81 |
| Increase of compensation (indefinite) estimated | | | | | 15,000,000.00 | 25,000,000.00 | 30,760,000.00 |
| Total | 1,098,602,065.64 | 1,122,471,919.12 | 1,114,490,704.09 | 1,628,411,644.81 | 18,881,940,243.79 | 27,065,148,933.02 | 6,454,596,649.56 |
| Deduct Post Office Department and Postal Service payable from postal revenues ⁴ | 286,319,125.26 | 316,777,886.96 | 314,245,638.39 | 326,493,008.82 | 335,696,345.12 | 385,712,029.58 | 412,528,240.12 |
| Total, exclusive of Post Office Department and Postal Service payable from postal revenues ⁴ | 812,282,940.38 | 805,694,032.16 | 800,245,065.70 | 1,301,918,635.99 | 18,546,243,898.67 | 26,679,436,903.44 | 6,042,068,409.44 |

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 20.—Appropriations for the fiscal years 1914 to 1929, including estimated permanent and indefinite appropriations and deficiencies for prior years—Continued

| | Second session Sixty-sixth Congress, fiscal year 1921 | Third session Sixty-sixth Congress and first session Sixty-seventh Congress, to July 12, 1921, fiscal year 1922 | First session Sixty-seventh Congress from July 13, 1921, and second session Sixty- seventh Con- gress, to July 1, 1922, fiscal year 1923 | Second session Sixty-seventh Congress from July 2, 1922, and third and fourth sessions Sixty- seventh Con- gress, fiscal year 1924 | First session Sixty-eighth Congress, fiscal year 1925 | Second session Sixty-eighth Congress, fiscal year 1926 | First session Sixty-ninth Congress, fiscal year 1927 | Second session Sixty-ninth Congress, fiscal year 1928 | First session Seventieth Congress, fiscal year 1929 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Legislative..... | \$18,452,570.22 | \$18,704,639.44 | \$15,164,781.72 | \$14,786,006.59 | \$14,648,136.13 | \$15,719,806.21 | \$20,159,979.29 | \$16,479,579.56 | \$18,969,912.87 |
| Executive Office..... | 222,880.00 | 228,884.00 | 351,040.00 | 497,325.00 | 426,027.63 | 534,180.00 | 823,710.00 | 438,460.00 | 437,180.00 |
| Independent offices..... | 931,951,812.18 | 165,732,573.40 | 757,412,716.01 | 522,562,946.59 | 411,216,020.48 | 596,346,702.32 | 639,941,425.65 | 520,040,576.30 | 648,088,845.55 |
| District of Columbia..... | 20,749,021.13 | 23,174,963.83 | 26,651,609.12 | 26,633,374.00 | 27,967,059.41 | 40,209,376.06 | 38,459,259.38 | 38,919,860.93 | 41,541,178.77 |
| Department of Agriculture..... | 144,796,021.64 | 49,812,678.45 | 145,545,265.81 | 110,661,561.06 | 74,636,707.16 | 146,714,807.90 | 167,571,650.53 | 153,429,535.94 | 163,667,683.31 |
| Department of Commerce..... | 23,912,398.82 | 17,911,419.04 | 20,784,277.56 | 22,115,621.94 | 24,123,472.86 | 25,143,491.11 | 31,526,372.73 | 36,821,839.14 | 40,712,898.75 |
| Department of the Interior..... | 346,356,959.05 | 352,895,185.33 | 328,255,752.95 | 343,518,583.31 | 292,322,988.51 | 274,825,930.95 | 270,351,203.91 | 285,800,112.99 | 353,331,839.17 |
| Department of Justice..... | 16,175,965.69 | 17,679,748.00 | 20,676,443.10 | 23,845,964.04 | 24,227,141.64 | 28,103,687.21 | 27,209,414.59 | 26,432,103.66 | 29,049,120.12 |
| Department of Labor..... | 6,098,739.86 | 5,393,019.25 | 8,607,395.53 | 7,518,677.95 | 8,363,910.44 | 9,338,003.25 | 10,183,979.18 | 10,160,396.00 | 11,181,459.67 |
| Navy Department..... | 453,578,251.07 | 489,651,232.99 | 300,513,661.17 | 325,322,863.18 | 278,600,933.22 | 324,752,032.96 | 325,790,513.07 | 320,465,998.47 | 394,736,344.74 |
| Post Office Department payable from Treasury..... | \$16,841,282.38 | \$14,338,758.15 | 554,288.22 | 441,826.65 | 173,449.43 | 244,353.02 | 31,995.10 | 17,934.27 | 66,896.12 |
| Post Office Department and Postal Service payable from postal revenues..... | 523,468,269.65 | 701,424,454.76 | 572,528,197.64 | 596,909,425.24 | 629,198,748.71 | 651,256,441.65 | 842,419,757.54 | 755,364,361.33 | 776,974,541.45 |
| Department of State..... | 11,098,034.64 | 11,021,902.75 | 17,569,844.41 | 15,896,026.53 | 15,246,097.09 | 18,187,323.23 | 17,818,512.78 | 12,312,353.33 | 15,608,814.27 |
| Treasury Department..... | 432,152,326.94 | 359,327,529.00 | 243,844,996.14 | 279,612,266.36 | 269,354,848.75 | 340,914,931.81 | 339,206,570.99 | 345,269,366.06 | 455,474,320.61 |
| Interest on the public debt..... | 1,017,500,000.00 | 922,650,000.00 | 1,100,000,000.00 | 940,000,000.00 | 865,000,000.00 | 830,000,000.00 | 795,000,000.00 | 755,000,000.00 | 675,000,000.00 |
| Sinking fund and other public debt retirements chargeable against ordinary receipts..... | 287,500,000.00 | 265,754,864.87 | 330,088,800.00 | 507,011,325.00 | 471,806,401.00 | 484,766,130.00 | 515,583,398.44 | 563,629,560.93 | 541,941,607.32 |
| War Department..... | 494,974,977.08 | 459,080,356.20 | 359,591,500.61 | 355,210,518.60 | 341,339,807.89 | 364,624,851.63 | 367,385,646.63 | 370,429,310.67 | 466,785,331.13 |
| Increase of compensation (indefinite) estimated..... | 35,000,000.00 | 35,000,000.00 | (9) | (9) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) |
| Total..... | 4,780,829,510.35 | 3,909,282,209.46 | 4,248,140,569.99 | 4,092,544,312.04 | 3,748,651,750.35 | 4,151,682,049.91 | 4,400,463,389.81 | 4,211,011,352.58 | 4,633,577,973.85 |
| Deduct Post Office Department and Postal Service payable from postal revenues..... | 523,468,269.65 | 701,424,454.76 | 572,528,197.64 | 596,909,425.24 | 629,198,748.71 | 651,256,441.65 | 842,419,757.54 | 755,364,361.33 | 776,974,541.45 |
| Total, exclusive of Post Office Department and Postal Service payable from postal revenues..... | 4,257,361,240.70 | 3,207,857,754.70 | 3,675,612,372.35 | 3,495,634,886.80 | 3,119,453,001.64 | 3,500,425,608.26 | 3,557,043,632.27 | 3,455,646,991.25 | 3,856,603,432.40 |

¹ Amounts given in this table for a specified fiscal year differ from the actual appropriations for that year since the former include deficiency appropriations for prior years provided in the session or sessions indicated, and exclude subsequent appropriations for that year provided as deficiency appropriations in subsequent sessions.

² These figures cover only those appropriations which have been specifically designated by Congress as payable from the Treasury and are exclusive of amounts which may be required under indefinite appropriations (payable from the Treasury) provided by law to supply deficiencies in the postal revenues. (See note 4 below.)

³ Includes \$35,698,400 additional compensation, Postal Service.

⁴ These figures include amounts which may be required under indefinite appropriations (payable from the Treasury) to supply deficiencies, if any, in the postal revenues.

⁵ The sinking fund created by the act of Feb. 25, 1862, was repealed by the act of Mar. 3, 1919 (40 Stat., p. 1312, sec. 6). The act of Mar. 3, 1919, created a cumulative sinking fund beginning with the fiscal year 1921.

⁶ Includes \$14,000,000 for deficit under Federal control of telegraph and telephone systems.

⁷ Includes \$11,053,081.92 certified claims.

⁸ Includes \$125,000,000 of accumulated interest on war-savings certificates, series of 1918, to be paid during the fiscal year 1923 though properly allocable to the full 5 years of their life and not simply to the fiscal year 1923.

⁹ Definite amounts appropriated by Congress, which are included in this column as appropriations under the several departments and independent establishments.

¹⁰ Absorbed by rates of pay included under the classification act approved Mar. 4, 1923.

TABLE 21.—Appropriations, by organization units, for the fiscal years 1925 to 1932, including estimated permanent and indefinite appropriations and deficiencies for prior years¹

| Organization units | Sessions of Congress | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Seventieth, second, 1930 | Seventy-first, first and second, 1931 | Seventy-second, third, 1932 |
| Legislative establishment..... | \$21,337,668.57 | \$29,520,710.26 | \$27,838,967.71 |
| Executive Office..... | 593,936.00 | 628,320.00 | 474,880.00 |
| Independent offices..... | 661,318,960.68 | 1,169,249,797.59 | 1,383,293,950.30 |
| District of Columbia..... | 42,569,344.17 | 52,488,230.45 | 80,142,891.30 |
| Department of Agriculture..... | 169,659,636.84 | 220,288,164.96 | 422,202,837.41 |
| Department of Commerce..... | 60,507,857.36 | 61,300,936.16 | 54,959,586.67 |
| Department of the Interior..... | 334,467,485.69 | 87,150,479.46 | 101,765,491.16 |
| Department of Justice..... | 30,770,680.25 | 42,247,989.16 | 58,522,184.44 |
| Department of Labor..... | 11,429,283.35 | 12,845,751.31 | 15,036,274.03 |
| Navy Department..... | 379,152,028.58 | 389,183,302.21 | 377,973,067.81 |
| Post Office Department payable from Treasury..... | 27,741.80 | 43,074,847.48 | 54,332.12 |
| Post Office Department and Postal Service payable from postal revenues..... | 842,125,220.20 | 840,271,353.70 | 844,610,273.01 |
| Department of State..... | 15,825,941.89 | 18,778,462.43 | 18,795,551.36 |
| Treasury Department..... | 427,393,167.75 | 372,556,973.56 | 278,586,653.97 |
| Interest on the public debt..... | 640,000,000.00 | 619,000,000.00 | 581,000,000.00 |
| Sinking fund and other public debt retirements chargeable against ordinary receipts..... | 553,067,629.02 | 635,324,000.00 | 468,509,905.00 |
| War Department..... | 474,990,185.89 | 477,799,374.83 | 494,758,121.66 |
| Total..... | 4,665,236,768.04 | 5,071,711,693.56 | 5,178,524,967.95 |
| Deduct Post Office Department and Postal Service payable from postal revenues..... | 842,125,220.20 | 840,271,353.70 | 844,610,273.01 |
| Total, exclusive of Post Office Department and Postal Service payable from postal revenues..... | 3,823,111,547.84 | 4,231,440,339.86 | 4,333,914,694.94 |

¹ Amounts given in this table for a specified fiscal year differ from the actual appropriations for that year since the former include deficiency appropriations for prior years provided in the session or sessions indicated, and exclude subsequent appropriations for that year provided as deficiency appropriations in subsequent sessions. For figures for 1916 to 1924, see annual report for 1930, p. 545.

² These figures cover only those appropriations which have been specifically designated by Congress as payable from the Treasury and are exclusive of amounts which may be required under indefinite appropriations (payable from the Treasury) provided by law to supply deficiencies in the postal revenues. (See note 3, below.)

³ These figures include amounts which may be required under indefinite appropriations (payable from the Treasury) to supply deficiencies, if any, in the postal revenues.

TABLE 22.—Accountability statement of appropriations, by acts of Congress, placed upon the books of the Treasury Department during the fiscal year 1931

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|--|--------------------|
| 1. Unexpended balances at beginning of year: | | | |
| Appropriations..... | \$779,378,796.92 | | |
| Disbursing officers' credits (includes outstanding checks)..... | \$222,777,115.19 | | |
| Deduct transfer of funds from disbursing account to warrant account (miscellaneous receipts) as explained in note 6, page 434..... | 1,600,000.00 | | |
| Unpaid warrants..... | 221,177,115.19 | | |
| | 939,458.08 | | \$1,001,495,370.19 |
| 2. Appropriations: | | | |
| Annual appropriation acts, 1931..... | 3,168,256,665.46 | | |
| Less immediately available appropriations under the foregoing acts set up during the fiscal year 1930, the unexpended balances of which are included under (1) above..... | 148,959,350.00 | | |
| Less amounts included in the annual appropriation acts for 1931 not payable from general fund of the Treasury..... | 852,552,332.88 | | |
| | 1,001,511,682.88 | | \$2,166,744,982.58 |
| Annual appropriation acts, 1932 (immediately available items)..... | | | 528,051,840.00 |
| Deficiency appropriation acts— | | | |
| Second deficiency act, 1930, approved July 3, 1930..... | 74,105,104.67 | | |
| Less amounts not payable from general fund of the Treasury..... | 2,798,163.29 | | |
| | | | 71,306,941.38 |
| First deficiency act, 1931, approved Feb. 6, 1931..... | 109,303,822.12 | | |
| Less amounts not payable from general fund of the Treasury..... | 29,794.34 | | |
| | | | 109,274,027.78 |
| Second deficiency act, 1931, approved Mar. 4, 1931..... | 83,991,031.79 | | |
| Less amounts not payable from general fund of the Treasury..... | 3,182,701.67 | | |
| Less amounts not available until July 1, 1931..... | 2,257,361.00 | | |
| | 5,440,062.67 | | 78,550,969.12 |
| Miscellaneous acts— | | | |
| Private relief acts..... | | | 298,303.43 |
| Public and private resolutions..... | | | 50,100,000.00 |
| Public acts..... | | | 266,000,000.00 |
| Permanent and indefinite appropriations, actual (various acts)..... | | | 1,334,230,738.23 |
| Amount reestablished from surplus fund for adjustment of fiscal officers' accounts..... | | | 73,778.29 |
| 3. Add receipts credited direct to appropriations..... | | | 26,296,505.57 |
| Total ordinary appropriations, exclusive of appropriations to cover amount of public-debt redemptions chargeable against ordinary receipts..... | | | 4,630,923,086.38 |
| 4. Add indefinite appropriations to cover amount of public-debt retirements chargeable against ordinary receipts..... | | | 48,421,586.56 |
| | | | 4,679,349,672.94 |
| 5. Deduct unexpended balances of lapsed appropriations carried to surplus fund..... | | | 24,609,171.23 |
| 6. Deduct unexpended balances at close of year: | | | |
| Appropriations..... | | | 1,139,844,520.52 |
| Disbursing officers' credits (includes outstanding checks)..... | | | 281,239,351.81 |
| Unpaid warrants..... | | | 4,054,374.83 |
| | | | 1,449,747,417.89 |
| Total to be accounted for as expenditures during fiscal year 1931 (see below)..... | | | 4,231,097,625.24 |
| 7. Balance according to daily Treasury statement, June 30, 1930 (unrevised)..... | 318,607,168.11 | | |
| Deduct net excess of expenditures over receipts in June reports subsequently received..... | 5,824,253.08 | | |
| | | | 312,782,915.03 |
| Receipts, fiscal year 1931— | | | |
| Ordinary..... | 3,318,636,558.45 | | |
| Public debt..... | 6,573,117,521.19 | | |
| | | | 9,891,754,079.64 |
| | | | 10,204,536,994.67 |
| 8. Balance according to daily Treasury statement, June 30, 1931 (unrevised)..... | 471,943,983.32 | | |
| Deduct net excess of expenditures over receipts in June reports subsequently received..... | 15,363,290.80 | | |
| | | | 456,580,692.52 |
| | | | 9,747,956,302.15 |
| 9. Deduct public debt expenditures..... | 5,956,940,676.91 | | |
| Less amount chargeable against ordinary receipts..... | 440,082,000.00 | | |
| | | | 5,516,858,676.91 |
| Total ordinary expenditures, according to daily Treasury statement (revised), chargeable against ordinary receipts..... | | | 4,231,097,625.24 |

NOTE.—The details of this statement are included in the combined statement of receipts and expenditures, balances, etc., of the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1931.

Expenditures
(On basis of warrants issued, net)

| Ordinary expenditures | 1910 | 1911 | 1912 | 1913 | 1914 | 1915 | 1916 |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| General expenditures: | | | | | | | |
| Legislative establishment..... | \$13,616,496.12 | \$13,344,838.28 | \$12,729,949.61 | \$13,291,813.52 | \$13,468,827.66 | \$13,577,399.19 | \$13,848,007.16 |
| Executive Office..... | 520,208.48 | 734,602.93 | 923,978.57 | 582,014.73 | 564,134.36 | 3,065,880.50 | 395,940.11 |
| State Department..... | 4,909,557.77 | 4,902,175.29 | 4,511,474.66 | 4,978,380.09 | 5,253,911.78 | 4,908,006.79 | 6,444,594.11 |
| Treasury Department..... | 66,082,776.09 | 66,407,481.63 | 65,942,023.34 | 62,113,949.60 | 60,139,856.78 | 71,107,291.59 | 73,737,017.80 |
| War Department..... | 158,172,957.27 | 162,357,100.49 | 151,048,895.67 | 162,607,913.09 | 175,759,873.57 | 175,188,626.92 | 166,853,552.23 |
| Department of Justice..... | 9,606,688.53 | 9,508,740.11 | 9,716,999.76 | 10,423,632.19 | 10,188,151.26 | 10,434,871.97 | 10,662,463.28 |
| Post Office Department..... | 1,622,294.55 | 1,946,378.28 | 1,893,037.00 | 2,169,340.97 | 2,236,202.24 | 1,894,873.64 | 1,770,710.04 |
| Navy Department..... | 123,974,208.39 | 120,728,786.19 | 136,389,659.75 | 134,092,416.93 | 140,543,059.30 | 142,721,524.13 | 155,883,194.66 |
| Interior Department..... | 201,189,691.29 | 201,968,760.45 | 197,761,593.88 | 217,775,365.89 | 216,311,437.70 | 215,687,935.30 | 201,658,832.61 |
| Department of Agriculture..... | 16,976,021.88 | 17,666,228.26 | 19,471,567.42 | 20,469,027.70 | 22,208,141.12 | 29,131,112.07 | 28,031,540.33 |
| Department of Commerce..... | 19,221,703.68 | 18,503,442.87 | 10,958,247.69 | 11,263,457.08 | 10,938,882.40 | 11,499,098.76 | 11,403,722.17 |
| Department of Labor..... | (1) | (1) | 3,508,750.62 | 3,347,380.11 | 3,768,904.05 | 3,783,611.86 | 3,531,144.47 |
| Veterans' Bureau..... | | | | | | | |
| Other independent offices and commissions..... | 2,323,799.33 | 2,555,973.64 | 2,553,747.68 | 2,878,325.95 | 3,232,179.61 | 5,738,773.78 | 7,221,803.24 |
| District of Columbia..... | 11,650,496.50 | 12,335,939.64 | 12,959,542.46 | 12,841,210.79 | 12,756,971.18 | 13,220,662.97 | 13,633,853.16 |
| Total..... | | | | | | | |
| Deduct unclassified items..... | | | | | | | |
| Total general expenditures..... | | | | | | | |
| Interest on public debt..... | 21,342,978.83 | 21,311,334.12 | 22,616,300.48 | 22,899,108.08 | 22,863,956.70 | 22,902,897.04 | 22,900,313.03 |
| Refund of receipts: | | | | | | | |
| Customs..... | | | | | | | |
| Internal revenue..... | | | | | | | |
| Postal deficiency..... | 8,495,612.37 | 133,784.29 | 1,568,194.88 | 1,027,398.79 | | 6,636,592.60 | 5,500,000.00 |

Footnotes at end of table.

Expenditures—Continued

| Ordinary expenditures | 1910 | 1911 | 1912 | 1913 | 1914 | 1915 | 1916 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Panama Canal..... | \$33,911,673.37 | \$37,063,515.33 | \$35,327,370.66 | \$41,741,258.03 | \$34,826,941.76 | \$29,187,042.22 | \$17,503,728.07 |
| Operations in special accounts: | | | | | | | |
| Railroads ¹ | | | | | | | |
| War Finance Corporation ² | | | | | | | |
| Shipping Board ¹ | | | | | | | |
| Agricultural marketing fund (net) ² | | | | | | | |
| Alien-property funds ² | | | | | | | |
| Adjusted service-certificate fund ¹ | | | | | | | |
| Civil-service retirement fund ¹ | | | | | | | |
| Investment of trust funds: ² | | | | | | | |
| Government life-insurance fund ¹ | | | | | | | |
| District of Columbia teachers' retirement fund ¹ | | | | | | | |
| Foreign Service retirement ¹ | | | | | | | |
| General railroad contingent ¹ | | | | | | | |
| Total ordinary expenditures ¹ | | | | | | | |
| Public-debt retirements chargeable against ordinary receipts ² | | | | | | | |
| Sinking fund ¹ | | | | | | | |
| Purchases from foreign repayments ¹ | | | | | | | |
| Received from foreign governments under debt settlements ¹ | | | | | | | |
| Received for estate taxes ¹ | | | | | | | |
| Purchases from franchise-tax receipts (Federal reserve and Federal intermediate-credit banks) ¹ | | | | | | | |
| Forfeitures, gifts, etc. ¹ | | | | | | | |
| Total public-debt retirements chargeable against ordinary receipts ¹ | | | | | | | |
| Total expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts..... | 693,617,064.45 | 691,201,513.22 | 689,881,334.13 | 724,511,963.54 | 735,081,431.47 | 760,586,801.33 | 740,980,416.47 |

¹ Included under expenditures for Department of Commerce.² No activities during this period.

Department of Commerce expenditure

| Bureau | 1922 | 1923 | 1924 | 1925 | 1926 | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 | 1932 | Estimate, 1933 |
|-------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| Office of Secretary..... | \$690,300 | \$895,250 | \$969,000 | \$1,098,380 | \$1,093,250 | \$1,247,920 | \$1,344,100 | \$1,382,700 | \$1,416,595 | \$1,914,945 | \$1,373,160 | \$1,558,342 |
| Radio Division..... | 80,000 | 130,000 | 139,200 | 205,238 | 220,525 | 335,000 | 364,000 | 476,160 | 490,000 | 502,372 | 646,700 | 598,500 |
| Aeronautics Branch..... | | | | | | 550,000 | 4,864,000 | 4,502,900 | 6,676,320 | 9,208,030 | 10,362,309 | 8,929,660 |
| Bureau Foreign and Domestic Commerce..... | 1,392,010 | 3,104,460 | 2,851,610 | 3,127,603 | 3,280,064 | 3,612,007 | 4,067,957 | 4,603,357 | 4,906,323 | 5,467,335 | 5,777,569 | 4,986,531 |
| Bureau of the Census..... | 1,927,680 | 1,952,340 | 1,952,340 | 5,347,470 | 2,204,000 | 1,974,000 | 2,164,960 | 2,146,450 | 24,740,000 | 8,497,000 | 6,270,580 | 1,116,250 |
| Steamboat Inspection Service..... | 990,790 | 906,140 | 900,740 | 1,050,030 | 1,057,470 | 1,062,670 | 1,080,060 | 1,169,800 | 1,192,168 | 1,373,355 | 1,395,120 | 1,280,790 |
| Bureau of Navigation..... | 227,140 | 242,140 | 252,155 | 802,715 | 812,109 | 812,109 | 314,020 | 330,880 | 367,215 | 395,140 | 498,280 | 409,695 |
| Bureau of Standards..... | 1,507,360 | 1,737,860 | 1,804,794 | 1,954,237 | 1,780,410 | 1,940,885 | 2,457,435 | 2,411,875 | 2,506,746 | 3,647,971 | 2,874,570 | 2,630,255 |
| Bureau of Lighthouses..... | 8,856,790 | 8,420,790 | 8,498,290 | 9,488,380 | 9,757,980 | 10,341,631 | 10,677,250 | 11,536,954 | 11,769,980 | 11,513,180 | 12,082,410 | 10,943,853 |
| Coast and Geodetic Survey..... | 2,129,690 | 2,176,975 | 2,186,275 | 2,370,844 | 2,327,650 | 2,336,670 | 2,757,284 | 2,455,127 | 2,537,186 | 3,023,024 | 3,075,933 | 2,881,500 |
| Bureau of Fisheries..... | 1,244,180 | 1,291,890 | 1,277,590 | 1,453,645 | 1,614,140 | 1,789,253 | 2,081,568 | 2,092,108 | 2,236,050 | 2,631,885 | 2,905,540 | 2,337,640 |
| Patent Office..... | | | 3,195,485 | 3,608,800 | 4,057,200 | 3,764,611 | 3,957,860 | 4,266,415 | 4,539,466 | 4,893,730 | 5,236,740 | 4,981,700 |
| Bureau of Mines..... | | | | 2,028,268 | 1,875,010 | 1,914,400 | 3,025,150 | 2,725,118 | 2,274,670 | 2,745,060 | 2,273,765 | 2,084,530 |
| Total, Department of Commerce..... | 16,891,120 | 20,817,685 | 20,821,979 | 26,347,982 | 29,570,418 | 31,180,647 | 39,153,644 | 40,099,844 | 65,702,719 | 55,813,027 | 54,775,660 | 44,719,304 |

¹ \$80,000—1930 and 1931.² Appropriated under Department of the Interior.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to a good deal of what the Senator from Mississippi has said. I regret that I was not in the Chamber at the time he began his remarks.

Several times in the past I have made similar statements as to the expenses of the Government, and as to the number of employees who are now and who in the past have been on the pay roll. One thing I have found out, that whenever an employee is dismissed by the Government, the very first thing that employee does is to go to his or her Representative or his or her Senator and bitterly complain, and immediately the Representative or the Senator either writes a letter or goes to the department in person and objects most bitterly to the dismissal. I dare say the Senator from Mississippi knows that to be a fact.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, yes; I have been guilty of the same thing. All of us have been guilty.

Mr. SMOOT. It is my idea, and I hope it may be carried out, that whenever the services of an employee—I do not care from what State he may come—are no longer required by any of the Government departments and he is separated from the service, his dismissal shall be final, and that bitter complaints will not be made against the department or the head of a division because of the fact that some employee's services have been dispensed with.

I know how it has been. I used to spend days and days and weeks and weeks going through all the departments in order to find out just how many employees there were in the departments and what they were there for. I have called to the attention of the Senate time and time again in the past the situation which existed. But I never made any headway.

I hope the speech made by the Senator from Mississippi to-day will result in something more than such statements have accomplished in the past, and I have a belief that it will, because in the past, of course, our revenues were greater than our expenditures, and there was no end to the demands made, and no end, it seemed, to the revenue raised under the law. But times have changed, just as the Senator from Mississippi has said, and I trust that not only every Member of the House but every Member of the Senate will recognize that fact, and that the heads of the departments will take notice of what has been said to-day in relation to the number of employees in the Government service. The number of employees has increased every year. Expenses have increased. Not only have the expenses increased, but the salaries have been increased.

I heartily approve of what I heard the Senator from Mississippi say, and I am sorry I was not able to be in the Chamber during his entire address. It seems to me the time has arrived when we shall have to take notice of conditions as they exist to-day.

As to Government publications, I want to say to the Senate that the expenditure of money upon many, many of the documents which have been published by almost all the departments of our Government has been nothing short of a wicked crime.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. Has the Senator thought at all of what would happen to the men or women who would be thrown out of employment at this time, when we have a surplus of labor in the United States of over 7,000,000?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I would say simply that if the departments would merely refrain from appointing others to take the places of those leaving the service by death or resignation, not replacing them, it would mean the saving of an immense amount of money in the end.

I have a report made to me every two weeks of all the changes in every department in the Government and in every bureau. I know just the changes which are taking place, and if what I have suggested were done, we would not have to do anything more.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I am surprised at what the Senator has said. He has some governmental bureau or a set of clerks who make a report to him covering the entire Government every two weeks.

Mr. SMOOT. It is made as to the number of employees here in the District of Columbia, not as to those outside. The Senator can get the information.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator would use his great influence to have that bureau dispensed with, so that there would not be so many people employed to supply the Senator with that information every two weeks, he would very materially help.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think that is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes.

Mr. SMOOT. No; that does not take any time to speak of. The departments know just about how many changes are made, and it is necessary only to have one person collect the information from all the departments every two weeks.

Mr. NORRIS. But they would not need to have all that information collected. If this information were not furnished, probably the departments could get rid of a dozen employees in every bureau who are using their time just to give the Senator from Utah information which does not come to anybody else. Why not discharge all those men and save the money?

Mr. SMOOT. It is not a matter of "all those men." And the Senator from Utah is not the only one to whom the information is furnished.

Mr. NORRIS. That is all the better. If it is furnished to somebody else, stop it, and we shall get economy.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think the statement referred to by my colleague is furnished by the Civil Service Commission. I know I get a statement, although I do not know how often, in the form of a tabulation every week or every two weeks indicating the changes which are made in the various departments. It is a very simple matter. The data are sent to Senators who ask for them, if not sent to all.

While I have the floor, Mr. President, I want to make another observation. One of the most distinguished lawyers, who served in the Department of Justice a few years ago, and who had charge of very important branches of the Department of Justice, perhaps none more important in that department, resigned after he had served for some time. My colleague knows him. He is a very distinguished man and a very great lawyer.

That man told me some time before he resigned that he intended doing so, and I asked him why. He said: "They have imposed upon me under the civil-service system scores of employees wholly incompetent. I can not discharge them, I can not get rid of them, and I can not do my work with those men. I am charged with dereliction, perhaps, because the work is not efficiently done. If they would per-

mit me to employ the necessary men, I would need only one-fourth the number of those who are assigned to me." There were many, many assigned to him. He added: "I would discharge the work a great deal better, but because I can not get competent men I am going to resign."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in reply to the two Senators from Utah permit me to say that the remedy is to abolish the Civil Service Commission and all the civil-service system. That would save lots of money. Turn the Government over to the spoils hunters. Abolish the civil service. From my observation, if that were done, judging from what I know about people getting jobs with the Government, it would mean that one would have to go to Utah and become a citizen of Utah in order to get a job in the city of Washington.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, since I have been in the Senate, several times I have listened to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] discuss these exorbitant Federal taxes. He is always lamenting the ill fate of the Federal taxpayers, but he never calls attention to who those taxpayers are or how much they are taxed. We get only about 14 per cent of the Federal taxes from tariff duties. Of course, he will have some argument against that and with a good deal of it I agree; but that is only a small part of our taxes.

There are only about two and a half million persons who pay income taxes into the Federal Treasury—about 1 in 50 of our people. Half of those pay only a nominal sum, so that there is really only one in a hundred who pays an income tax into the Federal Treasury of any substantial amount.

Who is this one in a hundred? Is it the farmer? I have not seen a farmer in seven years who paid any income tax. The biggest farmer in the United States told me he lost \$215,000 last year.

Is it the laboring man? No. He is not paying a Federal tax.

Is it the Federal employee? Yes; he is paying a little. He has to make a tax return of a small amount.

In the main it is the big profiteers, who levy taxes upon the people in excess profits, who are paying these taxes into the Federal Treasury. The \$300,000,000 tax reduction proposed by the Senator from Mississippi would only amount to \$43 for each of the 7,000,000 unemployed, while there are several billion of excess profits that ought to be taken by Federal taxation for relief.

The whole national net income since 1920 has averaged about fifteen or sixteen billion dollars a year; that is, after we pay our living expenses, after we pay the governmental expenses and every other kind of expense, we have about that much new wealth produced. But since 1920 agriculture has gotten none of it. Not only has it gotten none of it, but agricultural capital was reduced, up to 1928, by over \$30,000,000,000, and since then by several billion dollars more.

Did labor get it? No. Seven million laborers are now without any compensation or employment at all. Who did get it? It was these big fellows who pay into the Federal Treasury these large sums. Those are the chaps who got it, and they will get it as long as these gigantic incomes are levied upon the people of the country in excess profits, and most of this fifteen or sixteen billion dollars went into excess profits to a few big companies—a few men got nearly all of it. That fifteen or sixteen billion amounts to only about 4 per cent increase in the national wealth, and that has been true during the history of the country from the Declaration of Independence clear through. That is all we have had in wealth increase; that is all we have ever had to distribute, we might say, over a period of years.

That being true, under our economic system we set up a law which gives the railroads the right to charge 5¼ per cent, and that upon a valuation that is \$7,000,000,000 watered.

We set up a tariff law which awards gigantic profits to certain of the big industries of our country.

We set up patent laws which give an absolute monopoly to the patentee, who has no competition, either foreign or domestic, in the use of his specific patent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The election of a President pro tempore.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Iowa will proceed.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, above all we have these corporation laws, mostly State laws, which permit the organization of great combinations, which come into interstate commerce where the Congress has control; but they come without regulation or let or hindrance as to the profits they may charge the people of the United States. These various combinations, created and supported and backed up by laws, either of the State or the National Government, and in the case of most of the interstate commerce corporations aided and encouraged by lack of laws which Congress ought to enact, levy taxes upon the common people of the country through the prices they charge them for the products they produce. They take from the common people practically all of their earnings and pile up great profits which they hold for themselves, and discharge their labor if necessary to protect them.

That is the situation in the United States. The Steel Trust, for instance, watered its capital stock more than a billion dollars and made that water pure gold by collecting profits out of the people of the United States. The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. earned in the first nine months of 1931 the greatest profits in its history, a year of the depression, and it earned more in 1930 than it did in 1929.

Mr. President, just as long as we permit that condition to exist by the laws of this country I will never be found voting to reduce the salaries of any Government employees. Just as long as the Mellons and the Morgans and the Ras-kobs are permitted to take huge profits from the people of this country under the paternal care of the law I shall not vote to reduce my own salary; I need it much more than they need it, and I earn it better than they earn the profits we tax.

FIXING TERMS OF PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND CONGRESS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 14) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I notice that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] is not in the Chamber.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. A request was made that the absence of a quorum be suggested, but I am sure the Senator from Connecticut will be here in a moment, unless the Senator from Nebraska wants to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not myself ask for a quorum. I am ready to vote, but I think in order to carry out the implied promise at least, I will suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| Ashurst | Bulkley | Dale | Gore |
| Austin | Bulow | Davis | Hale |
| Bailey | Byrnes | Dickinson | Harris |
| Barbour | Capper | Dill | Harrison |
| Barkley | Caraway | Fess | Hastings |
| Bingham | Connally | Fletcher | Hatfield |
| Black | Coolidge | Frazier | Hawes |
| Blaine | Copeland | George | Hayden |
| Borah | Costigan | Glass | Hebert |
| Bratton | Couzens | Glenn | Howell |
| Brookhart | Cutting | Goldsborough | Hull |

| | | | |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Johnson | McNary | Sheppard | Vandenberg |
| Jones | Metcalf | Shipstead | Wagner |
| Kean | Morrison | Shortridge | Walcott |
| Kendrick | Moses | Smith | Walsh, Mass. |
| Keyes | Neely | Smoot | Walsh, Mont. |
| King | Norbeck | Steiwer | Waterman |
| La Follette | Norris | Thomas, Idaho | Watson |
| Lewis | Nye | Thomas, Okla. | Wheeler |
| Logan | Patterson | Townsend | White |
| McGill | Robinson, Ark. | Trammell | |
| McKellar | Robinson, Ind. | Tydings | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, may I ask under what order we are proceeding?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the unfinished business was temporarily laid aside and that Senate Joint Resolution No. 14 is now before the Senate.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. BINGHAM. I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is called for, which is the election of a President pro tempore.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, does the Chair hold that the regular order is the election of a President pro tempore?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the regular order.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to make a suggestion. I have not interposed what I believe would be a good objection at any time, because I did not want to interfere with the business of the Senate, although there might come a time when I would attempt to hold the election of a President pro tempore before the Senate. My own idea is, Mr. President, that the objection of the Senator from Connecticut is good and that the election of a President pro tempore is a privileged matter. I am not finding fault with him for making the objection.

I want to give notice, however, that while those of us who have been insisting on a vote here day after day believe that we have a right to confine the Senate to that particular question until it is settled, yet out of good will and courtesy to our fellows in the Senate we have been willing, by unanimous consent, to lay aside the unfinished business at various times. We took up the question of the moratorium, something to which I was opposed, by laying aside the unfinished business by unanimous consent. That action will be desired again when we reach Senate bill No. 1.

I myself asked this morning that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside because we have before us now a Senate joint resolution which has passed the Senate on five different occasions. It comes before us now in exactly the form in which it was voted on and in which it passed the Senate in the last Congress. I think that, perhaps, with the exception of three or four Senators every Member of the Senate is in favor of it. As I remember, on the various roll calls had there never was a time when to exceed seven voted against it.

I concede that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] is within his rights in what he is doing, but I want to give notice to the Senate that while I think his objection is good, yet when we go again to the election of a President pro tempore I intend to object from now on to the taking up of any other business until that matter is disposed of.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In this period of crisis to which reference is made every day, is it true that the parliamentary situation in the Senate is such that by calling for the regular order on the part of any Senator all legislation can be blocked until we have settled the inconsequential question as to who shall be President pro tempore of this body? Is that the parliamentary situation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would not so hold.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senate can proceed to the consideration of any business upon motion at any time

it chooses to do so, unless it has estopped itself from doing that by a unanimous-consent agreement, which is not the case here now. The Senator from Nebraska can move now to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course I can; but that would displace, unless another motion were made, the election of a President pro tempore, and I am not in favor of doing that. If my objection were held good—and, of course, I am not saying that it would be so held—I am willing to take the responsibility of saying that we will continue to vote on the question of the election of a President pro tempore to the exclusion of everything else until that question is settled. I am not finding fault with anybody who does not agree with me as to what the parliamentary situation is. I am conceding that the objection of the Senator from Connecticut is good.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the Senator has concluded, I merely desire to say that, in my judgment, it is in order for the Senator from Nebraska to move now to proceed to the consideration of his joint resolution, unless he prefers not to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to do that myself; I should prefer not to do so.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have not the slightest doubt, if the Senate desires to do so, it may supersede the unfinished business with any bill, resolution, or other matter that it chooses to take up by a majority vote. For my part, I think we have indulged in our favorite pastime of voting for the election of a President pro tempore, when there is no apparent prospect of a conclusion of that matter, just about long enough. If there should be any indication that a solution could be reached, there would, of course, be no objection to proceeding with the vote; but I am not willing to delay legislation for the mere purpose of voting when there is no promise and no indication that a conclusion is to be reached. I am ready now to take up the joint resolution of the Senator from Nebraska, and I can not for the life of me understand, in view of the record the Senate has made on the matter, why it should not be proceeded with. Of course, if the Senator from Nebraska does not desire to do so, I myself will not make the motion.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to be put in the attitude, and it is not right that any Senator should try to put me in the attitude that I myself now, because I refuse to make the motion, am opposed to the joint resolution that I have fathered here for the last 10 years.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Oh, no; nobody is attempting to do that.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to be put in the attitude that I am trying to delay it or anything of that kind, but I am not going, Mr. President, to submit to the laying aside of the business of the election of a President pro tempore until I am compelled to do so by a vote of the Senate. My own idea is that it is a privileged question, and I think a point of order could have been made at any time from the very beginning just as the Senator has now made it. I understand that the Chair is going to rule against me when I make the point of order; I understand that the Senate, by an overwhelming majority, is going to vote down the appeal that I expect to take from the decision of the Chair when he makes that ruling. Nevertheless, I think that is the orderly procedure. When that time comes I am squelched. I admit that the election of a President pro tempore is over; and Senators on the other side will not need to be afraid any longer that it might possibly result, if we keep it up, in the election of a Democratic President pro tempore.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the Senator does not mean to leave that impression, I am sure. If the Senator sincerely expects to accomplish the defeat of the election of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] as President pro tempore, he knows there is a quick way of doing that, and that is to vote for the other candidate who has received, since the beginning of this contest, a large plurality vote and has been within two votes of the election ever since the contest began.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, I know that; but if the Senator will exercise his reasoning faculties, he will know that I am not compelled to do that; that I am not going to do it; and that I am not going to jump out of the frying pan into the fire. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Nobody has suggested that the Senator from Nebraska shall do anything that he does not want to do, but that is a very different thing from his attempting to compel the Senate to keep on voting on the question of the election of a President pro tempore when the Senate has business to transact.

Mr. NORRIS. Talk about compelling the Senate! Everybody knows, I think, without exception, that if the Senate were faced with the proposition that nothing else could be taken up except the election of a President pro tempore, we would have that question off our hands after less than three ballots; the Senate knows in advance that the probabilities are that, on a point of order being made against taking up something else, the Chair is going to decide that we can take up something else. There is not any difference between this privileged motion, if it be a privileged motion—and I think it is—and any other privileged question. There is no reason why any insinuation should be cast against any Senator because he wants now to insist upon the consideration of a privileged question any more than there would on any other privileged question, like, for instance, the right of a Senator to his seat here upon the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Everybody knows such a report would be privileged; everybody knows that one objection could prevent the displacing of it by any other business; yet we all realize that when such an objection is made it tends to bring to a conclusion the privileged matter; and so it would in this case.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of making a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. If a Senator were now to move to proceed to the consideration of the "lame duck" joint resolution and the motion were agreed to, of course, I understand it would displace the regular order. Could the same Senator thereafter move to proceed again to the election of a President pro tempore?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that a motion to proceed to the consideration of business on the calendar, if carried by a majority vote, would bring that business before the Senate. The Chair would also hold that at any time any Senator may move to proceed to the election of a President pro tempore.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, in order to pour oil on the troubled waters, if I may, I am going to move, first, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the so-called "lame-duck" joint resolution, and if that motion shall be carried I give the assurance that I will then make a motion to proceed to the election of a President pro tempore. I make that motion now, unless I am requested not to do so by the author of the joint resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. When I make my point of order that will bring the question before the Senate—and I want to say, if I may be permitted to do so, in just a word that I hope, in making the point of order, no one will entertain the view that I am trying to defeat or to filibuster against the amendment to the Constitution that is now before the Senate and of which I am the author—I am in the embarrassing attitude that at the present time I must either make the point of order and take a ruling of the Chair against me, or I will see the motion carried and the prospect for the election of a President pro tempore ended so far as this Congress

is concerned. I prefer, Mr. President, knowing what the outcome is going to be, to follow the course that I believe it to be my duty to follow, by making the point of order which I now make against the motion of the Senator from Tennessee, that it is out of order because the effect of it would be to displace as the business before the Senate the election of a President pro tempore, which is a privileged matter.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I am through.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But I want to ask the Senator a question about a statement he just made.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator stated that if the point of order shall be overruled and the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of legislative business, it will make impossible the election of a President pro tempore during this session of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that would be the effect of the action.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Does the Senator have any doubt that if at any time any Senator desires to do so, when another matter taking precedence over it is not before the Senate, he may move to proceed to the election of a President pro tempore?

Mr. NORRIS. There is no misunderstanding between myself and the Senator on that point.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I will say that if there should be any opportunity of resolving the great issue as to the election of a President pro tempore I would be ready to return to it by a motion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to assure the Senator that I am perfectly sincere in stating that as soon as the measure of which the Senator from Nebraska is the author shall have been voted upon, I intend immediately thereafter to move that the Senate proceed to the election of a President pro tempore. What I want to do is this: I do not want this privileged question to be used by Senators here and there who may be opposed to a certain bill in such a way as to be interposed as an objection to the consideration of such bill. I think we ought to proceed in an orderly way.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee and to the Senator from Arkansas that I recognize that any Senator may make a motion to proceed to the election of a President pro tempore; but I believe, as a practical result, that what I have already indicated would follow, namely, that that would be the inevitable end of it; in other words, Senators would not vote to take up the question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I will say frankly to the Senator from Nebraska that unless, as I have already said, I have some information, there is a prospect of resolving the issue and settling it, and securing the election of a President pro tempore, I do not see anything to be accomplished by coming back to it.

Mr. NORRIS. My idea is that there never will be a prospect unless we determine to stay with it until the end, and then the prospect will come.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the motion of the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution of the Senator from Nebraska shall be adopted and then a motion shall be made later to proceed to the election of a President pro tempore, and that motion shall be carried, the question of the election of a President pro tempore will resume the position it now holds as being the unfinished business and the regular order.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree to that, but the Senator has an "if" in there—"if that motion shall be carried."

Mr. BARKLEY. Everything here has an "if" in it.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that, but that is a pretty big "if." The motion will not carry, and I would not find fault with anybody for not voting for it if we are just going to take it up now and then and lay it aside for anything else that may come up. I do not think we will ever reach any conclusion in that way; but if we follow what I believe to be the law and hold that it is a privileged matter, before we adjourn to-night we could elect a President pro tempore. I make the point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know that I am in order, but I had always supposed that the election of a President pro tempore was a privileged matter. If it is proper, I am going to ask the Presiding Officer if there is any precedent in parliamentary law for holding that it is not privileged?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In 1911 when the question of the election of a President pro tempore was before the Senate, the office having become vacant by reason of the resignation of Senator Frye, of Maine, the efforts to secure an election were eventually abandoned because of a deadlock, and there was no election throughout the Congress under the resolution of 1890. Certain Senators were elected by unanimous consent to serve for stated periods during the absence of the Vice President, Mr. Sherman. Subsequent to his death in October, 1912, the Senate, early in December, adopted an order designating Senators Gallinger and Bacon to serve for certain periods during the remainder of that Congress.

The Chair is ready to rule. There are only three questions mentioned in the Senate rules which are to be proceeded with until disposed of:

First. Motions to amend or correct the Journal—Rule III.

Second. Questions and motions arising or made upon presentation of credentials of Senators—Rule VI.

Third. Measures upon which cloture has been invoked—Rule XXII.

Any other matter, by necessary implication, could be displaced at any time by a majority vote of the Senate, by simply agreeing to a motion to take up any particular matter or measure.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. With great respect to the Chair, I appeal from his decision.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to be heard for just a moment on that question.

I think it was generally believed—in fact, generally conceded by everybody—that this was a highly privileged matter. There are Senators now looking at me with whom I have talked, and I have not found one of them but has agreed with me that this is a privileged matter. I am wondering how they will vote.

Through two or three sessions—at least through one—the Senate wandered along, voting day after day, and failed to elect a President pro tempore. The question, as I examined the precedents, was never exactly passed on. The Senate took up other business, it is true, just as we have done, but the point was not raised. It was done, in effect, by unanimous consent. The matter went on through a whole session, and no one was elected. At another session a long delay occurred in the election of a President pro tempore. From the chair, however—and I could go over all that; I have it here—Senator Lodge, who was then presiding, expressed the opinion that the matter was privileged, although he was not called on to make a decision. The point was not raised. So what we are doing here, it seems to me, is laying aside a privileged proposition in order to take up something that is admittedly of no privilege.

With that statement, so that the RECORD may show just what has happened, I am ready, so far as I am concerned, for a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Vice President state the question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] rose to a parliamentary inquiry; and the Chair held that a motion might be made to proceed to the consideration of business on the calendar, and that, if carried by a majority vote, it would displace the present unfinished business. The Chair further held that any Senator, at any time after an affirmative vote was had, could move to proceed to the consideration of the election of a President pro tempore.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Chair permit an interruption?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not appeal from that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is simply going back and stating the entire situation.

Mr. NORRIS. The question is whether the motion is in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Afterward the Senator from Tennessee made a motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 14. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Norris] made the point of order that the motion was not in order, which the Chair overruled. The Senator from Nebraska then appealed from the decision of the Chair. The question now is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Chair permit a parliamentary inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. DILL. If the point of order is overruled and the motion of the Senator from Tennessee is carried, will the present President pro tempore continue in office?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He will.

Mr. DILL. The Vice President will not appoint a President pro tempore?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly not. Under the resolution of 1890 the President pro tempore serves until his successor is elected.

Mr. NORRIS. I call for the yeas and nays on the appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, this matter is such an important question that I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|
| Ashurst | Couzens | Howell | Patterson |
| Austin | Cutting | Hull | Robinson, Ark. |
| Bailey | Dale | Johnson | Robinson, Ind. |
| Barbour | Davis | Jones | Sheppard |
| Barkley | Dickinson | Kean | Shipstead |
| Bingham | Dill | Kendrick | Shortridge |
| Black | Fess | Keyes | Smith |
| Blaine | Frazier | King | Smoot |
| Borah | George | La Follette | Stelwer |
| Bratton | Glenn | Lewis | Thomas, Idaho |
| Brookhart | Goldsborough | Logan | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bulkley | Gore | McGill | Trammell |
| Bulow | Hale | McKellar | Tydings |
| Byrnes | Harris | McNary | Vandenberg |
| Capper | Harrison | Metcalf | Wagner |
| Caraway | Hastings | Morrison | Walcott |
| Connally | Hatfield | Moses | Walsh, Mont. |
| Coolidge | Hawes | Neely | Watson |
| Copeland | Hayden | Norris | Wheeler |
| Costigan | Hebert | Nye | White |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Norris] has demanded the yeas and nays on the appeal from the decision of the Chair. Is there a second?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRNES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Oddie]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. KENDRICK (when Mr. CAREY's name was called). On this question my colleague [Mr. CAREY] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY]. I have no information as to how the Senator from Ohio would vote. If present, my colleague would vote "yea."

Mr. HASTINGS (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Ala-

bama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent. I have promised to take care of him with a pair for the day. I do not know how he would vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). On all votes connected with this subject I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], which I transfer to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. In his absence, not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. VANDENBERG (when his name was called). On this question I have a special pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BARKLEY (when Mr. WATERMAN's name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BLACK. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] is detained from the Senate on official business. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BULKLEY. I am paired with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY], who is absent; but I am advised that if present he would vote in the same way that I desire to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McKELLAR (after having voted in the affirmative). May I ask if the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have already voted. I have a pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] is absent on official business. He has a pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL].

Mr. BINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). Has the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have a general pair with him. I understand that if present he would vote as I have voted. Therefore I will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. HASTINGS. I understand that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], with whom I am paired, would vote as I would vote. I therefore am at liberty to vote and vote "yea."

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] is detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON and Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are detained from the Senate on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—54

| | | | |
|---------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| Ashurst | Caraway | Goldsborough | Kean |
| Austin | Connally | Gore | Kendrick |
| Bailey | Coolidge | Hale | Keyes |
| Barbour | Copeland | Harris | King |
| Bingham | Couzens | Harrison | Lewis |
| Black | Dale | Hastings | McKellar |
| Bratton | Davis | Hatfield | McNary |
| Bulkley | Dickinson | Hawes | Metcalf |
| Bulow | Fess | Hebert | Morrison |
| Capper | Glenn | Hull | Patterson |

| | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|--------|
| Robinson, Ark. | Steinwer | Tydings | Watson |
| Sheppard | Thomas, Idaho | Wagner | White |
| Shortridge | Thomas, Okla. | Walcott | |
| Smith | Trammell | Walsh, Mont. | |

NAYS—17

| | | | |
|-----------|-------------|--------|-----------|
| Blaine | Dill | Logan | Shipstead |
| Borah | Frazier | McGill | Wheeler |
| Brookhart | George | Neely | |
| Costigan | Johnson | Norris | |
| Cutting | La Follette | Nye | |

NOT VOTING—24

| | | | |
|-----------|---------|----------------|--------------|
| Bankhead | Glass | Oddie | Stephens |
| Barkley | Hayden | Pittman | Swanson |
| Broussard | Howell | Reed | Townsend |
| Byrnes | Jones | Robinson, Ind. | Vandenberg |
| Carey | Moses | Schall | Walsh, Mass. |
| Fletcher | Norbeck | Smoot | Waterman |

So the decision of the Chair was sustained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 14.

FIXING TERMS OF PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND CONGRESS

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 14) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, this joint resolution is in exactly the same form of language in which a similar measure passed the Senate in the last Congress. A like measure has passed the Senate prior to this time five times. On only two occasions was a vote reached in the House of Representatives. Once the vote, while a large majority, was not a two-thirds majority, and the joint resolution failed. In the last Congress it passed the House in a modified form and was sent to conference near the close of the short session of Congress. It died in conference, no agreement having been reached.

I do not care to take up the time of the Senate in explaining the joint resolution further, because I think all of us are perfectly familiar with the provisions. I ask unanimous consent, however, to include at this point, as a part of my remarks, the report of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Senate Report No. 26, Seventy-second Congress, first session]

FIXING THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE TERMS OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. NORRIS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report (to accompany S. J. Res. 14):

The Committee on the Judiciary, having had under consideration the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 14) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress, report the same to the Senate with the recommendation that the same do pass.

This resolution is in exactly the same form as it passed the Senate in the Seventy-first Congress and in practically the same form as it passed the Senate in five preceding Congresses. There is practically unanimous sentiment in the country in favor of this amendment. No logical objection has ever been made to the constitutional changes suggested, and its passage again by the Senate will be only a response to a patriotic sentiment, country wide, for the proposed amendment.

In practically the same form as here reported this resolution passed the Senate the first time on February 13, 1923 (S. J. Res. 253, 67th Cong.). On the 22d day of February, 1923, it received a favorable report from the House committee and was placed on the House Calendar. No action was taken by the House, and it died on the 4th day of March, 1923, because of the adjournment of Congress. It passed the Senate the second time on the 18th day of March, 1924 (S. J. Res. 22, 68th Cong.), and on the 15th day of April, 1924, it was favorably reported by the House committee. It remained on the calendar of the House, without any action being taken thereon, from the 15th day of April, 1924, until the expiration of the Sixty-eighth Congress on the 4th day of March, 1925. It again passed the Senate in the Sixty-ninth Congress (S. J. Res. 9) on February 15, 1926. It was again favorably reported by the House committee on the 24th day of February, 1926, and remained on the House Calendar, without any action thereon, from said date until the expiration of the Sixty-ninth Congress on the 4th day of March, 1927. In the Seventieth Congress the resolution (S. J. Res. 47) passed the Senate on January

4, 1928, and was referred to the House committee, from which it received a favorable report. On March 9, 1928, the House acted on it, and, while it received a large majority of those voting, it failed to receive the two-thirds majority required by the Constitution.

In the Seventy-first Congress, on June 7, 1929, the resolution (S. J. Res. 3), in exactly the same form as it is here reported, passed the Senate. On the next day, June 8, 1929, it was sent to the House of Representatives. However, it was not referred to a committee but remained on the Speaker's table until the 17th day of April, 1930. On that date the Speaker referred the joint resolution to the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter (Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress). In the meantime, other resolutions similar to this one were introduced by Members of the House of Representatives and referred to this committee for action, and on the 8th day of April, 1930, the committee reported one of these House resolutions (H. J. Res. 292) to the House of Representatives. After this had been done, the Senate resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the committee. No action was ever taken by the committee on the Senate resolution; but, on the 24th day of February, 1931, the House of Representatives took up the House resolution (H. J. Res. 292) and, by unanimous consent, the Senate resolution (S. J. Res. 3) was taken from the committee and laid before the House, when it was amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the House resolution, which, in many respects, was practically the same as the Senate resolution. In this form it passed the House of Representatives on the same day, February 24, 1931. Conference committees were at once appointed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, but no agreement was reached and the resolution failed when the Seventy-first Congress ended on the 4th day of March, 1931.

The resolution proposes to amend the Constitution of the United States by fixing the beginning of the terms of President and Vice President at noon on the 15th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 2d day of January following their election in the preceding November. Under existing conditions a new Congress does not actually convene in regular session until a year and one month after its Members have been elected. When our Constitution was adopted there was some reason for such a long intervention of time between the election and the actual commencement of work by the new Congress. We had neither railroads nor telegraphic communication connecting the various States and communities of the country. Under present conditions, however, the result of elections is known all over the country within a few hours after the polls close, and the Capital City is within a few days' travel of the remotest portions of the country.

Originally, Senators were elected by the legislatures, and as a rule the legislatures of the various States did not convene until after the beginning of the new year, and it was difficult and sometimes impossible for Senators to be elected until February or March. Since the adoption of the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution, however, Senators have been elected by the people at the same election at which Members of the House are elected. There is no reason, therefore, why the Congress elected in November should not be sworn in and actually enter upon the duties of office at least as soon as the beginning of the new year following their election.

The only direct opportunity that the citizens of the country have to express their ideas and their wishes in regard to national legislation is the expression of their will through the election of their representatives at the general election in November. During the campaign that precedes this election the great questions demanding attention at the hands of the new Congress are discussed at length before the people and throughout the country, and it is only fair to presume that the Members of Congress chosen at that election fairly represent the ideas of a majority of the people of the country as to what legislation is desirable. In a government "by the people" the wishes of a majority should be crystallized into legislation as soon as possible after these wishes have been made known. These mandates should be obeyed within a reasonable time.

Under existing conditions, however, more than a year elapses before the will of the people expressed at the election can be put into statutory law. This condition of affairs is not only unfair to the citizenship at large, who have expressed their will as to what legislation they desire, but it is likewise unfair to their servants whom they have elected to carry out this will. It is true that it is within the power of the President to call an extraordinary session of Congress at an earlier date than the one provided by law, but the new Congress can not be called into extraordinary session until after the 4th of March, which would not give the new Congress very much time for the consideration of important national questions before the summer heat in the Capital City makes even existence difficult and good work almost impossible. It is conceded by all that the best time for legislatures to do good work is during the winter months. Practically all the States of the Union recognize this fact and provide for the meeting of their legislatures near the 1st of January. Moreover, the wishes of the country having been expressed at an election should not be dependent for their carrying out upon the will of the President alone. Provision should be made by law so that the new Congress could begin the performance of its important duties as soon after election as possible and under conditions that are most favorable for good work. Under existing conditions a Member of the House of Representatives does not get started in his work until the time has arrived for renom-

nations in his district. He has accomplished nothing and has not had an opportunity to accomplish anything because Congress had not been in session. He has made no record upon which to go before his people for election. It is unfair both to him and to the people of his district. In case of a contest over a seat in the House of Representatives, history has shown that the term of office has practically expired before the House is able to settle the question as to who is entitled to the contested seat. During all this time the occupant of the seat has been drawing the salary, and if it is decided in the end that the occupant was wrongfully seated, then the entire salary must again be paid to the person who has been unjustly deprived of his seat. Double pay is therefore drawn from the Treasury of the United States and the people of the district have not been represented by the Member whom they selected for that purpose. No reason has been given why a new Congress elected at a general election to translate into law the wishes of the people should not be installed into office practically as soon as the results of the election can be determined.

Another effect of the amendment would be to abolish the so-called short session of Congress. If the terms of Members of Congress begin and end in January instead of on the 4th of March, as heretofore, and Congress convenes in January, there would be no such thing as a short session of Congress. Every other year, under our Constitution, the terms of Members of the House and one-third of the Members of the Senate expire on the 4th day of March. The session begins on the first Monday in December and because of the expiration of such terms it necessarily follows that the session must end not later than the 4th of March. Experience has shown that this brings about a very undesirable legislative condition. It is a physical impossibility during such a short session for Congress to give attention to much general legislation for the reason that it requires practically all of the time to dispose of the regular appropriation bills. The result is a congested calendar both in the House and the Senate. It is known in advance that Congress can give attention to but a very small portion of the bills reported from the committees. The result is a congested condition that brings about either no legislation or illy considered legislation. In the closing days of such a session bad laws get through and good laws are defeated on account of this condition and the want of time to give proper consideration to anything, and the result is dissatisfaction, not only on the part of Members of Congress but on the part of the people generally. Jokers sometimes get on the statutes because Members do not have an opportunity, for the want of time, to give them proper consideration. Mistakes of a serious nature creep into all kinds of statutes which often nullify the real intent of the lawmakers, and the result is disappointment throughout the country. Such a congested condition in the National Legislature can not bring about good results. However diligent and industrious Members of Congress may be, it is a physical impossibility for them to do good work. Moreover, it enables a few Members of Congress to arbitrarily prevent the passage of laws simply by the consumption of time. In every way it brings about an undesirable legislative condition, and it is not surprising that results are so often disappointing.

There is another very important reason why this change should be made. Under the Constitution as it now stands, if it should happen that in the general election in November in presidential years no candidate for President had received a majority of all the electoral votes, the election of a President would then be thrown into the House of Representatives and the membership of that House of Representatives called upon to elect a President would be the old Congress and not the new one just elected by the people. It might easily happen that the Members of the House of Representatives, upon whom devolved the solemn duty of electing a Chief Magistrate for four years, had themselves been repudiated at the election that had just occurred, and the country would be confronted with the fact that a repudiated House, defeated by the people themselves at the general election, would still have the power to elect a President who would be in control of the country for the next four years. It is quite apparent that such a power ought not to exist, and that the people having expressed themselves at the ballot box should through the Representatives then selected, be able to select the President for the ensuing term. If the amendment we have proposed is adopted and becomes a part of the Constitution, such a condition could not happen, and in such a case the new House of Representatives fresh from the people would be the one upon which would devolve the power to select the new President.

Section 3 of the proposed amendment gives Congress the power to provide by law who shall act as President in a case where the election of a President has been thrown into the House of Representatives and the House has failed to elect a President and the Senate has likewise failed to elect a Vice President. The importance of this can be understood when we realize that under the present Constitution if the election of President and Vice President should be thrown into Congress on account of a failure of the Electoral College to elect, and that the House should fail within the time specified in the Constitution to elect a President, and the Senate should likewise fail during such time to elect a Vice President, the country would be left entirely without a Chief Magistrate and without any means of selecting one. This condition has, it is true, never happened in the history of the country, and while it may never happen, it does seem very important that some constitutional provision be enacted by which this most dangerous emergency may be avoided. The present Constitution gives power to Congress to provide who shall act as President when there is a

vacancy both in the President's office and the Vice President's office caused by death, removal, or resignation, but there is no provision in the present Constitution that gives to Congress or any other authority the power to select an acting President in cases where the election has been thrown into the House of Representatives and where the House of Representatives has failed to elect a President, and the Senate has likewise failed to elect a Vice President. If such a contingency should occur, and it is liable to occur after any presidential election, the country would find itself in a condition where it would be impossible for a Chief Magistrate to be selected. The committee has corrected this defect by giving to Congress in section 3 of the proposed amendment the authority to select the acting President in such an emergency.

The question is sometimes asked, Why is an amendment to the Constitution necessary to bring about this desirable change? The Constitution does not provide the date when the terms of Senators and Representatives shall begin. It does fix the term of Senators at six years and of Members of the House of Representatives at two years. The commencement of the terms of the first President and Vice President and of Senators and Representatives composing the first Congress was fixed by an act of Congress adopted September 13, 1788, and that act provided "that the first Wednesday in March next be the time for commencing proceedings under the Constitution." It happened that the first Wednesday in March was the 4th day of March, and hence the terms of the President and Vice President and Members of Congress begin on the 4th day of March. Since the Constitution provides that the term of Senators shall be six years and the term of Members of the House of Representatives two years, it follows that this change can not be made without changing the terms of office of Senators and Representatives, which would in effect be a change of the Constitution. By another act (the act of March 1, 1792) Congress provided that the terms of President and Vice President should commence on the 4th day of March after their election. It seems clear, therefore, that an amendment to the Constitution is necessary to give relief from existing conditions.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator to two verbal matters. In line 6, section 2, occurs the word "begin." It reads:

The Congress shall assemble at least once a year, and such meeting shall begin at noon.

I observe that in the original Constitution the word is "be" and not "begin"; that "such meeting shall be," and so forth.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in the original Constitution there is no hour fixed. It merely fixes the day of the month. This fixes the hour, and it seems to me the word "begin" is proper. That is the form in which we have always passed the joint resolution.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I could not see any reason at all for the change, because it does not make any difference whether we fix a definite hour or a definite day.

Mr. NORRIS. My own idea is that the word "begin" is more appropriate than "be." If it was to be a meeting which would exist for a moment and pass away, "be" would probably be the most appropriate word, but the session is to run possibly for some time, and this fixes the time of its beginning.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the sentence begins "The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting"—that is, the assembling, the coming together—"shall be at noon on the 2d day of January." That is the sense of the sentence, and it occurs to me the language in the original Constitution is more appropriate.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in my opinion it does not change the meaning at all, but it seems to me the meeting referred to is the session. It is going to be a session. First, they shall assemble, and the word "begin," it seems to me, when we are to fix a definite time, is more appropriate than to say, "The session shall be."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The suggestion is not of such importance as to be debated. The sense is sufficiently apparent. I merely thought the Senator would like to follow the language of the original Constitution.

Let me pass on to another matter: Should not the word "they," the second word in line 11, be "it"?

Mr. NORRIS. That is another instance where we are just reversed. There we follow the Constitution, and the Senator's suggestion would not follow the Constitution.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator is quite wrong about that. The Constitution uses the word "they" always when it refers to the United States, but the word "they" is not used in this connection.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am satisfied that this is a direct quotation from the Constitution of the United States. But let me say to the Senator that the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] is to make some remarks on the joint resolution, and if it is agreeable to the Senator from Montana, we will look this matter up while that Senator is proceeding.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I hope the constitutional lawyers will have opportunity to settle this matter before we have to vote on it. I propose to offer an amendment, which I think everyone will remember was offered in the House of Representatives by the late Speaker, Mr. Longworth, who was a friend of all of us, revered by the House on both sides of the aisle.

At the time when this matter was considered by the House of Representatives, Speaker Longworth offered an amendment to it, and he broke his almost universal practice by coming down on the floor and making a speech in favor of that amendment. The amendment is one which appeals very strongly to me and appeals to some of those who have generally supported the amendment to the Constitution which was offered by the Senator from Nebraska in repeated Congresses.

In order that those who are doing me the honor of listening to me may understand just what the amendment is, I will offer it and read it from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was offered on February 24, 1931. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Longworth] offered the amendment, to strike out all of section 2. If Senators will turn to their copy of the pending joint resolution, they will find that section 2 relates to the fact that Congress shall assemble at least once in every year and that such meeting shall be on the 4th day of January unless they by law appoint a different day. In other words it permits a permanent session of the Congress. It would meet every year on the 4th of January and apparently continue until the Members get tired or the next session begins.

Speaker Longworth offered this amendment, to strike out all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year. In each odd-numbered year—

In other words, the year following the presidential election—

such meeting shall be on the 4th day of January unless they shall by law appoint a different day. In each even-numbered year—

In other words, the year in which the election is held—

such meeting shall be on the 4th day of January, and the session shall not continue after noon on the 4th day of May.

In other words, instead of adjourning on the 4th of March, the Congress would continue for two months longer, until the 4th of May, when, as I think we will all appreciate, many Members of the House of Representatives and some Members of the Senate would like to go home and start work on their primaries, or on the election to follow a few months later.

With the indulgence of the Senate I should like to read what the distinguished Speaker said on that occasion. His remarks are not very long, being only one column of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His speech is so much better than anything I could say on this matter, I am sure, that as one of the few speeches Mr. Longworth made after he became Speaker, and the last important speech he made, it will be interesting to many Senators. I read:

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, as you all know, I infrequently take the floor during the consideration of a bill or offer an amendment to a bill, but this is such an extremely important and vital matter that I think it is not only a privilege but a duty to offer this amendment.

I do not intend to debate the merits or demerits of this resolution. I desire, however, to call your attention to what, to my mind, is the fundamental objection to it in its present form. Under this resolution, as is obvious, it will be entirely possible for Congress to be in session perpetually from the time it convenes. There is no provision in the resolution for a termination either of the first session, or particularly of the second session. It seems to me obvious that great and serious danger might follow a perpetual two years' session of the Congress.

I am not one of those who says the country is better off when Congress goes home. I do not think so, but I do think that the Congress and the country ought to have a breathing space at least once every two years.

The effect of this amendment is simply to provide that the second session of the Congress shall terminate upon the 4th day of May in the even-numbered years. That is a fair proposition. It will give at least one month more for the consideration of legislation in the second session than is given now. There will be a clear four months' period between the assembling of the Congress in the second session and its adjournment. Can there be any real reason for opposition to a proposal which will give the Congress four months during the second session and then having May, June, July, August, September, and October clear? Those are the years when we all come up for election. Those are the years—every four years—in which national conventions are held. It is not wise that Congress should be in session during the holding of national conventions. It is wise that men should have time in which to canvass their districts and prepare for election.

The history of this matter, in so far as I have been concerned with it, is this: Something over three years ago, just before this resolution came up in the House, I was invited by perhaps the strongest organized body of intellectuals in the country, the American Bar Association, to give my views on this matter. I gave my views and stated, as I state now, that with the adoption of this amendment, providing for the termination of the second session, all my objections to this resolution would be withdrawn. The committee of the Bar Association with which I conferred adopted my views. Having indorsed the resolution previously, they withdrew that indorsement and unanimously indorsed the resolution with the inclusion of a provision such as I am now offering.

It seems to me that from every point of view this amendment ought to be adopted. I will do anything I can to help the passage of this resolution provided this amendment is adopted. This afternoon I propose to even go farther than that. In the interest of the speedy passage of this resolution, with this amendment, I will recognize a request that the Senate resolution, as amended by the House resolution, be considered in lieu of the House resolution. That will offer an opportunity to immediately send the bill to conference, and, under all the circumstances, is, I think, a proper courtesy to the Senate.

In reply to a question from Mr. MONTAGUE as to whether the amendment would interfere with the President calling an extra session, Mr. Longworth replied:

Not at all. This is precisely the provision that was in the original resolution three years ago. In case of any emergency the President may call the Congress to meet on the 4th day of May and continue the session long enough to satisfy the emergency. The amendment would have no effect in that direction.

Gentlemen, I sincerely hope this amendment may be adopted.

It was a matter of record that when the amendment was put to a vote in the House a division was taken and there were 193 ayes and 125 noes.

Mr. President, in the report made by the Judiciary Committee I find the record of the number of times the joint resolution has passed and a statement that by unanimous consent the Senate joint resolution in the last Congress was laid before the House, when it was amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the House resolution, which, in many respects, was practically the same as the Senate resolution. In this form it passed the House of Representatives.

In view of the fact that it was in so many respects the same as the Senate joint resolution I hope that the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the author of the amendment will be willing to adopt the amendment originally proposed by former Speaker Longworth and which I now offer as an amendment to the pending joint resolution.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. DILL. I am in much sympathy with the purpose of the amendment of the Senator, but I want to ask the Senator whether he does not think a later date than that in the main resolution would be better? Does he not think it would be better to make the date June 15?

Mr. BINGHAM. Of course the Senator from Washington would not ask that if he were a member of the Republican Party, because the Republican Party meets in national convention on June 14 and not the 15th.

Mr. DILL. That happens to be so this year.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the Senator will support the amendment, I shall be glad to change it to June 2.

Mr. DILL. I shall do so. I may say to the Senator that it was my understanding that the House conferees that year were willing to advance the date to a later date. I think there is much to be said for the amendment if the date is made a later one.

Mr. BINGHAM. Would the Senator be willing to vote for it if the date is made June 2?

Mr. DILL. I certainly will.

Mr. BINGHAM. Then I ask permission to change the date and make it June 2.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, how many changes in the date will the Senator offer in order to get votes for his amendment?

Mr. BINGHAM. I have stated that the Republican national convention is to be held on the 14th of June, and it is not possible to postpone it. The Democrats, as the Senator well knows, meet at a later date.

Mr. BARKLEY. If this is merely a matter of barter and trade and the Senator is willing to put off for a month the final adjournment date in return for a vote, I wonder how much longer he would be willing to put it off for another vote?

Mr. BINGHAM. June 14 is a date which concerns quite a number of us.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think, so far as the country is concerned, that is going to be a very ineffective date, anyway; but be that as it may, does not that still leave with us the same proposition that always faces us in the short session of Congress, whose termination is fixed by the Constitution, when we are required to adjourn whether we have finished the business of Congress or not? Does it not quite emphasize the conviction that one session of Congress is less important than another? That is one of the vicious things, it seems to me, which has surrounded our whole legislative situation. We have had three months in which we were required to perform the duties of a whole session, and if we could not perform them by the 4th of March, we had to adjourn anyway.

In his amendment the Senator makes it the 4th day of May, and he makes the assembling of Congress one month later so as to add only one month to the short session. I do not think there is any more wisdom in limiting one session of Congress than in limiting both sessions. Congress ought to be amenable to the people and responsive to their needs and will. I am not one of those who believe that the so-called short session is of any less importance than the so-called long session. One of them may be as important as the other. It may frequently happen, as it has in the past, that the short session is more important than the long session, depending on the questions which confront the people and the Congress.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] says this is only one month longer for the proposed short session than at present. It is two months longer.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. SMITH. If we meet on the 4th of January, then we will have January, February, March, and April, which is four months; whereas under the present order of things we can practically discard December because the holidays intervene, and so we really have only two months of the short session. We would have practically four months of unbroken session under the proposal of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true, in a sense; but I think in an important matter like amending the Constitution of the United States we ought not to take into account holidays or political conventions or primary elections. We ought to take into consideration the wisdom of an amendment to our fundamental law without regard to political conventions.

Mr. SMITH. Does not the Senator consider certain elections sometimes are more important than a session of Congress?

Mr. BARKLEY. In the minds of some people, especially candidates for office, that is no doubt true.

Mr. SMITH. I am talking about parties. I am not talking about candidates for office.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the minds of the American people I doubt very much whether they consider the election of any particular person to any particular office more important than a full session of Congress.

Mr. SMITH. I am sorry the Senator did not get the significance of the very brilliant remark I made.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is due to my own dullness and not to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. The point I was making was that there comes a time when a change of parties is more important than a session of Congress. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], I think, made a very appealing and sensible suggestion.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to hear the Senator say that. It is such a rare thing that it ought to be acknowledged.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator mean it is rare in this body that anyone should have these accomplishments?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Be that as it may, I think that the Senator from Connecticut has just about the right idea about the situation. Four months of unbroken consideration of legislative matters, coupled with an interminable session preceding it, seems to me to be the proper thing to have. I appreciate that under our present conditions. I never have been able to understand how our forefathers fixed a session just antedating the holidays.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was purely accidental. They did not fix it.

Mr. SMITH. No matter how it came about, it was so fixed, and it means that all of December and practically the first week in January are lost. We can eliminate that period of time. But under the proposition of the late Speaker of the House to give us each two years four months of unbroken consideration of legislation seems to me to be a very proper thing to do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield further to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator think that this particular Congress is better qualified to fix an arbitrary date for the adjournment of every other session of Congress for 100 years than the Members of a future Congress will be at the time it is in session, confronted as it will be by the problems which will then be before it for consideration?

Mr. SMITH. I think even under the cumbersome system we have now we have done fairly well. I do not know of any great harm that has befallen the country by virtue of any of our delays. I think we ought to have one year during a given term of Members of Congress with a statutory limitation for the final adjournment of Congress. I think we are just as competent to fix it as any subsequent Congress may be to determine adventitiously whether to adjourn or to keep on working. The Senator knows that it means, if we do not put a limitation somewhere within a given Congress, that we would never adjourn. He knows that to be true.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not know that. On the contrary, the history of our whole legislative program for 100 years, and especially since the war and at any other time except when there is a great emergency on, shows that Congress is just as anxious to adjourn one year as it is another. We have adjourned here in May when we could have remained in session until December. We have adjourned in June when we could have remained in session until December. Congress can be depended upon, I think, each year to adjourn whenever it has concluded its business; but I do not believe there ought to be a stop watch placed upon a session of Congress, not only because we may not finish the business before us but because at an arbitrary date, when we are compelled to adjourn regardless of the state of the business, any Member of this body, as

we all know, can use that fact for the purpose of filibustering against legislation that ought to be enacted. We have to go no further back than last March when it was impossible for us to enact legislation needed in the country, because it was possible for one man to hold the floor until noon on the 4th day of March and that we could not transact any business as long as that situation existed. That would be true in April or in May or in June or July, or in any other month, if an arbitrary date were fixed in the amendment for the final adjournment of a session of Congress.

Mr. SMITH. But the Senator has had too much experience in life to know that we can legislate for exceptions. That was an exception.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it was not an exception. It has been the rule, at least in the last two years.

Mr. SMITH. I have been here a long time—

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator will remain much longer.

Mr. SMITH. I do not recall any occasion except that, and I do not know that any very great harm was done even by the incident to which the Senator refers. However, I do not believe that it is wise for us, especially in years when there is a national political campaign, to have any Member of Congress who is up for reelection handicapped by his duty here or perhaps handicapped by his duty at home.

Mr. BARKLEY. Some of us could be reelected more readily by staying here than we could by leaving here and mixing with the people frequently.

Mr. SMITH. That is only another exception that proves the rule.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I had no application to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. Perhaps the Senator is thinking of his own case.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina that "charity begins at home."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely want to make this suggestion: It is not, of course, a reason why the Constitution should be amended, but it is a practical matter that ought to be taken into consideration.

From time to time the question has arisen whether we would adopt a more stringent cloture rule of procedure in this body; from time to time we have had the threat of cloture; from time to time we have resisted it; and it seemed to be wise, in the judgment of the Senate, not to put a limitation upon debate in this body, especially upon those great questions as to which it seemed wise to the Senate to deliberate. Whenever any date is fixed by the Constitution for the adjournment of the Congress, it necessarily makes possible a filibuster; it invites it. Necessarily, therefore, it makes possible the continued agitation for stringent rules against filibustering, such rules as would restrict the freedom of speech and the freedom of debate in this body.

While the question I am now bringing to the Senator's attention is not fundamental, when we consider the responsible duty of amending the Federal Constitution, nevertheless it is pertinent. It would be very much wiser, it seems to me, if we should place no limitation upon any session of Congress, and should leave the matter within the discretion of the sitting Congress. I think we are justified in reposing confidence in future Congresses, and I am quite sure that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] would not be willing to limit or restrict debate in this body; but if we have the recurrence of filibustering here that he has observed during his term in the Senate, I am quite sure that ultimately we will have what we, now at least, agree are improper and undesirable restrictions upon debate.

There is no occasion for restriction upon debate if the definite date for the termination of the Congress shall not be fixed; but if that shall be done, the question of the restric-

tion of debate will arise from time to time and ultimately we shall have a limitation upon debate that ought not to be placed upon it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia is thoroughly aware of the fact that as to any proposal which is so distasteful to a group that they will enter into a determined filibuster, the probability of such a filibuster is scarcely enhanced by virtue of the imminence of the day of adjournment. Talking about putting restriction on debate, I desire to suggest that some of the most determined filibusters we have had in this body were not undertaken when the date of adjournment was imminent. We have modified the rules so that, while not arbitrarily cutting off debate, that object could be accomplished by the petition of a certain number of Senators.

Mr. GEORGE and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from South Carolina is quite right about that; but the point is that when a definite date is fixed for adjournment a filibuster against relatively unimportant and trivial matters, over measures, let us say, that arise out of prejudice, more or less, may block all other legislation between the time when the filibuster begins and the absolute fixed date for adjournment. That sort of abuse would ultimately persuade the Senate to modify its rules under which freedom of debate is now indulged.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, every Member of this body knows that we have postponed important legislation for one reason or another until the very last hours of the short session of Congress, and in those last hours we have had once or twice a filibuster that jeopardized proper legislation.

I maintain that under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], with anything like diligence, we could in the untrammelled four months enact the necessary legislation; and I do not see why as to one session of a Congress there might not be a limitation placed on its duration.

Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire merely to make this further suggestion, emphasizing what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has said: While, as the Senator from South Carolina has stated, it is possible at any stage of any session for one Member or a small group to organize a filibuster, the chance of its success or of effective damage being done by it is not nearly so great in the beginning or the middle of a long session as at the end of a short session, when Congress has got to quit on a certain day at a certain hour, regardless of the circumstances. The success of obstructive methods in the Senate, by and large, depends upon whether we are compelled to adjourn on a day certain, so that Senators may hold the floor and prevent action on other measures, regardless of the situation.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator from Kentucky knows that we have certain supply bills, certain appropriation bills, that are of vast importance; and we are compelled, under the present order of things, to dispose of them between January and March 4. We have merely that short time in which to act upon them. Under the proposition of the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, as presented now by the Senator from Connecticut, by continuing in session from the 4th of January to the 4th of May we should have four months—and a month longer even if we should use December, which we do not now use—in which to pass the important bills and discharge our duty.

Mr. BINGHAM. May I say to the Senator that in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] I have indicated a willingness to add one month more, making it five months in all, and extending the time to the 4th of June?

Mr. BORAH and Mr. DILL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH. I have stated my position. I am through, unless the Senator desires to ask me a question.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, this is the proposition which was submitted to the conferees when the joint resolution was before them at the last session. The conferees upon the part of the Senate were unable to agree to this amendment. It seemed to those representing the Senate that it did not obviate one of the great evils which flows from fixing a day certain upon which adjournment must be taken. Against that day all the forces which want to defeat legislation can play. Notwithstanding the length of time a session may last, important—in fact, the most important—legislation may come up, as we know it often does, right at the close or before the close of a session, and any Senators or any combination of Senators desiring to prevent legislation have that day certain against which to play for time. The fixing of a day certain for adjournment is the father of filibusters in the Senate, and as we know, the occasion for a filibuster may arise upon the first day of June just as much as it may arise on the first day of March. So by fixing a date in June we would not be obviating the great evil of a fixed day for adjournment.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. DILL. Does not the fact the Senator just mentioned, namely, that it is the day certain against which everything runs, involve a consideration that Senators have not thought about, namely, that if we do not fix a day certain on which to adjourn final adjournment will be almost indefinite, because there will always be many Senators and Members of the House of Representatives who want bills passed, and they will vote against final adjournment? At present, when there is no day fixed for adjournment of the long session every other year, another session of the same Congress convenes the following December, and Senators and Members of the House have an opportunity to procure consideration of their bills during that session; but if we should provide no fixed date for the adjournment of the second session Senators and Members of the House will be disposed to keep the Congress here.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Washington, an experienced legislator, knows that there is never any difficulty in securing final adjournment of Congress.

Mr. DILL. I do not want to be understood as agreeing to that, because there has never been an occasion in the history of Congress when we did not have another session at which we could bring up our bills.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I think there is a great deal of force in what the Senator says about fixing a time in the Constitution. It does make possible filibusters. There is the possibility of filibustering, though, without it, because we always decide by resolution at what time we will adjourn, and, of course, we can hold such a resolution off until the very last.

Mr. BORAH. We decide, but we very rarely decide until the business of the session has practically been completed or it is certain that it will be completed. We do not adopt resolutions providing for a final adjournment when there is any business still pending and undisposed of; and resolutions fixing a time certain for the two Houses to adjourn almost inevitably, so far as I know, follow the disposition of important business, because otherwise there would be serious objection to considering such a resolution. The more the Senator thinks about this matter the more readily will he see that the desire to get rid of the filibuster is entirely made futile if we fix a date certain for adjournment.

Mr. FESS. I admit that; that is obvious.

Mr. BORAH. But if the time for adjournment is within the discretion of the Congress, Congress can always exercise its judgment as to when it shall adjourn and, therefore, can always control the question of whether or not a particular time shall be fixed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the Senate desires to rid itself of the possibility of filibuster, it can easily accomplish that end by changing its rules. The fact that the filibuster has persisted in spite of prolonged and repeated efforts to modify the rules so as to enable a Senator to force the previous question or pursue some similar method of closing debate argues conclusively that the Senate is not ready to abandon the filibuster in extreme cases. In other words, we have preserved the filibuster and we will not eliminate the filibuster by adopting the constitutional amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska; we will still preserve it. If we want to get rid of the filibuster, we can do it by simply providing for changes in our rules that will make impossible the carrying on of such process.

Mr. BORAH. It is practically impossible to adopt a rule which operates speedily enough to shut off a filibuster which may be organized in the last 48 hours of the session if there is a time fixed for final adjournment. The Senator has seen it happen here, and so have I, that a filibuster begins the night before the time fixed for adjournment. We have seen that happen three or four times, and it is practically impossible to get a rule to operate sufficiently speedily to prevent that kind of filibuster if there is a time certain fixed for adjournment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not agree to that. If the Senate adopted the rule of the House of Representatives, or of other legislative bodies, it could easily conclude debate at any time; it could limit debate; it could provide for such limitation on debate as to enable a Senator to take the floor at any time within a few hours of adjournment and move the previous question. Its rules could provide for a vote without further debate and thus conclude a question even during the very expiring hours of a session.

I took the floor merely to point out the fact that there is something strange about an effort to justify an amendment to the Constitution to end filibusters when the filibuster exists only by virtue of the rules that we ourselves have established and perpetuated.

Mr. BORAH. I do not desire to see any such rule as the Senator indicates adopted by this body; I would rather suffer the evils of the present provision of the Constitution. If the amendment to the Constitution fixing a day certain would superimpose upon us that kind of a rule I would much prefer to see the matter stand as it is. Only by the most rigid exacting rules, such as moving the previous question and other rules which would destroy the Senate as a deliberative body, could we preclude the possibility of a filibuster. I would not for one moment adopt any such rules if my vote were necessary to do so.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Would the Senator resist a rule that, say, during the last six days of the session no Senator shall speak more than once nor more than 30 minutes upon any question?

Mr. BORAH. I should want to reserve my discretion on a question of that kind.

Mr. FESS. That would end filibusters.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to ask for the Senator's comment on this suggestion: If there is any virtue in limiting, by statute or by constitutional provision, the length of the second session of any Congress in order to protect the country against unwise legislation, why deny them the boon of the same sort of protection at the first session? If the Congress can not be trusted to act with discretion and

judgment and wisdom in the second session, by what sort of a miracle can we impute to them such patriotism and wisdom as that they can do it in the first session without inflicting irreparable damage upon the country?

Mr. BORAH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] offers the amendment that was offered by the late Speaker of the House of Representatives. I do not care to comment on the Speaker's speech, which has been read here, because, under existing circumstances, I think it probably would not be right to get the ideas or the opinions of a man who is no longer living mixed up in this debate.

In a general way let me say that this proposition comes from the enemies of the joint resolution, the enemies of the amendment, men who have opposed it during most of the time it has been pending before the people of the United States. It is offered here by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], a man who has always opposed this joint resolution, who has always fought it.

I doubt whether I would be justified in telling the Senate what the impression made upon the conferees on the part of the Senate was at the time this matter was in conference; but the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] is here, and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] sits here at my right. They know the controversy that went on there; and this proposal did not come to us until the very closing hours of the session, just a few days before we were compelled to adjourn on the 4th day of March. We met regularly every day in that conference committee; and I think we were all impressed with the real thing that was behind this amendment—no compromise; nothing was possible, and we adjourned hopelessly divided.

Now, what is the proposition? It is for us to provide in the Constitution that no future Congress will be wise enough to know when to adjourn its second session. We are going to say here that a Congress that meets 40 years from now must adjourn on a particular day. Do we know enough to know when to quit? Maybe we ought to quit sometimes when we do not, but sometimes we have to quit when we ought not to be compelled to quit.

What is the objection to letting Congress determine when it shall adjourn? Then, too, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] well said, you who are advocating this motion permit Congress in the first session to adjourn when it sees fit. Why not stop them then when they get up to a certain date in the calendar?

If you are going to limit a session, Senators, then you ought to limit the first session and not the last one. The last one is the more important of the two. If you want to limit a session, let me repeat, limit the first one and not the last one, because when the first one is limited you know that in that Congress there is still another session; but if you limit the second one, as far as that Congress is concerned, the last hope disappears and is gone.

I concede what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] says, that we could change the rules and stop all debate. By rule we could say that we could pass a bill before it is printed, as we have been asked to do to-day. We have an illustration of it right before us now in the proposal to take up Senate bill No. 1, when even the committee that was considering the amendments did not have them printed before it. The committee print is brought in here before the bill is printed for the use of the Senate, and one Senator after another is told that with the terrible condition just ahead of us, with everything going to the bowwows, we ought to pass the bill to-day.

Suppose you adopt this amendment and fix the 4th day of June as the day when you have to adjourn, and you have a President in the White House like we have now who sends a message up here on the 3d day of June, saying, "The country is going to be disrupted 12 hours from now unless you pass this legislation that I send up here," and we all tumble over each other to pass it, and we wake up the next day to find that we have all been "gypped" and fooled and nobody understood what they were doing, and you give

it no consideration. If that happens in the first session, if that is limited, you can remedy it at the next session; but you can not remedy it if it happens in the second session. The Congress is ended, and unless the President should call you in session you have no way to reassemble.

We do not have any trouble about adjourning in the long session, where it is not limited. We always have some controversy over it, it is true. Some Members want to adjourn and some do not; but the majority determine the matter, and as a rule we adjourn early in June, sometimes in May. Sometimes, in case we have a tariff bill or some other very important legislation, we run through the summer months, or we take a recess and convene again. If you put this limitation on the second session, you can not do that, and you may want to do it. It may be that the very life of the country will be at stake at a time when you want to do it, but unless you have a President who will call you back you can not do it. We may be in the midst of a war, and the Congress may be in controversy with the White House; but when the gavel falls, even if you adopt this amendment, out you go, and there is no way for you to reassemble.

Why put that burden upon Congresses whose Members have not yet been born? Why not give them credit for having some sense? Let them decide when they will adjourn, as we decide in the long session now.

I want to tell you, Mr. President, that no filibuster ever made much headway unless it was in a session of Congress where the date of adjournment was definitely fixed by law; and it does not have to occur right before the 4th of March, either. It may happen in January or December, because every Senator and every Member of the House knows that every hour of the short session that is taken up, whether it is in December, January, February, or March, means that there is so much less time before the 4th of March; and if you start a filibuster in December its effect may be felt next March, when you come to the time to adjourn.

There is not any way to prevent things of that kind unless you let that Congress determine for itself when it shall adjourn, and that is a simple matter. Practically, with the exception of the short session, of course, we have always had that right. There may be a time in the history of the country, that may come next year or the year after that or 40 years from now, when to save its life Congress would not dare to adjourn, when the exigencies of the occasion would demand that they be in session. Let us not cripple those Congresses now by putting manacles upon their hands and upon their feet.

We can not foresee what is in the future; and therefore it seems to me we ought to let future Congresses have the right that we have had, to fix their own date of adjournment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The Senator knows that I have always supported this joint resolution whenever it came up.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. FESS. But I have some sympathy with the suggestion of making a limit to one of the sessions, if it is not too short. I thought five months probably would be better than to make it unlimited. Has the Senator made any investigation as to why the States have limited the tenure of their legislatures? Our State does, and a great number of States do.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; a great many States do, and I will say to my friend from Ohio that I would not have any particular objection to it in a State. The Congress of the United States, however, may have in its hands the very salvation and life of the country, as it has had in the past many times; and to say that at such a time we shall be compelled by the Constitution of the United States to adjourn, it seems to me, might turn out to be almost national suicide.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to a question?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I assume that the object in fixing the second day of January rather than the first Monday in January was to avoid the possibility of meeting on New Year's Day.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me say to the Senator that in the various forms which this joint resolution has gone through since it was introduced, a great many years ago, there have been some changes in the dates. As I introduced the joint resolution originally, I think it provided for the first Monday, or the first Tuesday after the first Monday, something of that kind, to avoid Congress meeting on the Sabbath day, as it will occasionally. The House committee at various times took it up, and while the joint resolution never got through the House in that form I had a great many informal discussions with Members of the House about this matter, and they were objecting to fixing a day of the week, and wanted to have a particular date named. Afterward we changed it here, and the last two or three times we passed it, I think, we have had a definite date.

It is true that there would come times when we would have to convene on Sunday; but it is true now that we are in session on Sunday every time the 4th of March comes on Sunday. That is a common thing; and, as far as I know, it has not interfered particularly with the Congress, nor has it affected anyone's conscientious convictions, so far as I know. Personally I would a little rather it would not be on the Sabbath day, but I think it is better to have a definite day.

For instance, the Constitution says the term of a Senator shall be six years. You would have to have Congress convene on a different date from the time he actually took office in order to have him serve exactly six years. You avoid all that by fixing a definite date.

I will say to the Senator, however, that the exact date, and whether it shall be a week day or a day of the month, are, of course, matters that do not go to the fundamental principles involved in the legislation; but this amendment does, in my judgment. So I am surprised that Senators of long experience should want, by a definite constitutional arrangement, to fix a positive date when Congress must cease work.

I say to Senators that they do not realize what that might mean. In my judgment, there is no occasion for it. I think we are competent to fix a definite date for final adjournment, as well as to fix a date to adjourn over the holidays.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, all the Congresses which have ever assembled have been under the compulsion referred to. They have been compelled to terminate their short sessions on the 4th of March, and the country has not suffered greatly by that, as I see it.

Mr. NORRIS. The country has suffered a good many times, in my judgment. I have seen legislation defeated by a filibuster which nearly everybody wanted to see passed. I have seen much other legislation passed without due consideration, because everybody had something else he wanted to get through, and little time could be taken in analyzing a bill, in going through it, in debating it and discussing it, and asking questions about it; every moment was precious, and Senators would let an elephant go through in order to have enacted before the gavel fell at noon on the 4th day of March something they felt to be vital. It has meant injury to the country.

There are other changes in the Constitution of which I might speak, in answering the Senator's question as to whether we have not lived so long and nothing has hurt us. That may be true, but we do not know what is going to happen in the future. We can not tell.

I implore Senators to think of this deeply before they vote in favor of a proposition which, in my judgment, has no merit, and, secondly, has been an instrumentality of the enemies of this kind of legislation from the beginning.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. How can anyone tell with any degree of certainty that the country has not been damaged or injured because we have been living a century and a half

under a system which we are now trying to change? How can anybody say how much better off the country would have been if the conditions had been different, if we had not been required to adjourn every other year on the 4th of March?

Mr. NORRIS. Of course.

Mr. BARKLEY. How can anybody be dogmatic about it?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think anybody can be, I will say to the Senator. But in addition to that, in the early history of this country the importance of this kind of an amendment would not have been observed. There was a very small House of Representatives, a small Senate, and a small country, and the legislators had all the time they needed. But the country has been growing by leaps and bounds. Everybody knows now that it is impossible for us to complete the business of a session before the 4th of March. Even if the time should be extended a few months, there would probably come a time when we could not transact all the business of a session within the limits then in force, and there would have to be another change. Let Senators answer the question if they can, Why fix a date? Why not have faith enough in the Congresses which shall follow to believe that they will be able to fix their own date and fix it correctly?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will detain the Senate but a moment. I am very heartily in favor of the pending joint resolution as it is drawn.

There is one matter in connection with it to which I want to call the attention of Senators. Under the present provision we really do not have time to consider appropriation bills in the short sessions of the Congress.

Last year we appropriated \$5,252,000,000 in about two months' time. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and I say to Senators that I believe every man on that committee did conscientious work, rendered faithful service in passing on those vast appropriations; but the bills passed on by the committee could not be properly considered by that committee, or by any committee, or by the Congress, or by either branch of it, for the reason that we did not have time. We were under terrific pressure every moment of the time after Congress convened.

When appropriation bills are brought over to the Senate from the House, the usual rule is that amendments only are really considered. We do not have time to go through the various provisions of the bills, either in subcommittee or in the full committee, or in the Senate or in the House.

The bill making appropriations for a particular department will be sent to Congress. If the House wants to add amendments, they are printed in italics. If the Senate wants to add amendments, they are printed in italics; and we consider only the amendments. In the Senate the bills are read for amendment. Bills carrying millions and sometimes hundreds of millions of dollars are passed by the two bodies without any consideration of the various items.

The junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], who does not happen to be in the Chamber at the moment, has constantly inveighed against that method of legislation. It is an imperfect method; but as long as we have a 3-month session or a 4-month session, or even if we shall have a 5-month session, we are going to have the same trouble.

Therefore I say to the Senate that, in my judgment, if we consider no other reason, this joint resolution should be agreed to. I think the other reasons advanced are splendid. It is urged, first, that if his amendment were put into the Constitution there would be no further filibusters. That furnishes a perfectly valid reason for adopting the amendment. The right of every Congress to say when it wants to adjourn is another valid reason. But one of the most important reasons to the people of this country is that Congress should have time to pass upon the great appropriation bills, appropriating billions of dollars of the people's money every year.

I believe that at the last short session, if the Senate Committee on Appropriations, composed of perfectly splendid men, patriotic men, men who are seeking to do their duty by their Government and by their country, had had ample

time, we would have saved hundreds of millions of dollars in the appropriation of the people's money. There were many items in those bills passed over without a word, which, if they had ever been debated, either in committee or in the Senate, would not have passed. So, if we want to have an economical Government, if we want to cut appropriations to such figures as they ought to be cut to, we should have more time.

The Senator from Nebraska said just a moment ago that we have a very different Government now from what we had when it was founded. Our forefathers, as farseeing as they were—and they were the most farseeing set of men who ever lived—did not realize that the time might come when the Congress would have to appropriate as much as \$5,000,000,000 in one year.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this joint resolution ought to be passed, not only for the reasons which have already been advanced but for this additional reason, that the Congress should have time each session properly to pass upon the appropriations which are made. We have not that time now. If the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut should be adopted, we would not have time properly to do the work.

Five billion dollars is an immense amount of money. It ought not to be treated lightly. We frequently pass appropriation bills as a matter of course. I have known of appropriation bills carrying \$100,000,000 being passed in an afternoon session. That should not be. It would not be done if we had the time in the short session to discuss the measures as they ought to be discussed.

Mr. President, I am heartily in favor of this joint resolution. The Senate has shown time and again that it is in favor of this amendment to the Constitution, and I believe that it ought to be passed, and that it ought to be passed at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I have a great deal of sympathy with what the Senator from Tennessee has said. Like him, I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I have often been filled with regret at the haste with which we had to consider bills.

I would like to call his attention to the fact that, notwithstanding the fact that we have no constitutional necessity for adjourning early in June at the present time, we practically always do adjourn early in June, except in time of war. It is always possible, in time of great emergency, for the President to call an extra session. It is possible under the Constitution for the Congress itself to fix an earlier day of meeting. It would have been possible for Congress last March, before it adjourned, to decide to meet on the 1st of September, had it so chosen. But it did not so choose.

Under the amendment which I have proposed, which is slightly at variance with that proposed by Speaker Longworth, because it gives an additional month, instead of there being only two active months—namely, January and February—in the short sessions, for the consideration of appropriation bills, we would get five active months, January, February, March, April, and May, until the 4th day of June.

From my observation in the last few years, I am convinced that that would provide abundant time for the consideration of appropriation bills. Therefore, it seems to me, that that argument does not hold.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator makes the statement that Congress usually adjourns by June. I have been a Member of the Congress, counting my service in both Houses, for a little more than 20 years. There may have been another, but I do not recall more than one session of the long Congress in that long period of time when we adjourned by June, and never, so far as I can now recall, have we adjourned prior to that in the long session of Congress. The truth of the matter is that the sessions have extended to the latter part of July, sometimes until August, and, as Champ Clark used to say, until usually about the time the snow begins to fly.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Tennessee has taken advantage of the fact that I have been here for only 7 years while he has been here 20

or more, and his memory goes back much further than mine. I do not remember any Congress, except in war times, when we sat until the snow began to fly. We seldom have snow in Washington in July or August. I remember that three years ago we adjourned early in June. We have adjourned, in my recollection, about the 3d of July. But, after all, it would seem as though five months were a sufficient length of time to handle appropriation bills.

As the Senator from Nebraska has said, and in his report has mentioned, this proposed amendment to the Constitution has aroused great interest in the country. A great many newspaper editorials have appeared in favor of the so-called Norris "lame-duck" amendment. I have read a great many of those editorials. So far as I can recollect all of them refer to the fact that a Congressman elected in November of one year does not take his seat until December of the following year, and they are in favor of a Congressman taking his seat sooner after election. That is the point in which the country has been interested. But nothing has been said about that here to-day. In the amendment which I have proposed no change is made in that. There is merely a provision to prevent the continuous sitting of Congress for one reason or another.

It was pointed out in the debate in the House last year by Mr. GLOVER, of Arkansas, who spoke in favor of the Longworth amendment, that not only should Congress have a breathing spell, and the Members of Congress have a breathing spell, but "if we have a given task to be performed in a given time we will devote ourselves to that." He goes on to say:

Another argument made by the Senator, I think, is worth being emphasized, and that is the fact that in presidential election years, regardless of whatever party is in power, politics would enter; if we were in power, of course, we would make it hard for you, and if you were in power you would do the same thing to us. In other words, politics would be played in Congress that ought not to be played. I believe we can finish our business in the presidential year by the time specified in this resolution, and that we can accomplish our purpose, and that we can go out and have a little rest ourselves and give the people one.

Mr. President, it has been pointed out by no less a distinguished person than Prof. Everett S. Brown, of the University of Michigan, in the American Political Science Review that—

In public discussions of the proposed Norris "lame-duck" amendment, and in demands by Members of Congress for special sessions to meet temporary emergencies, the fact is often overlooked that Congress itself has the power to regulate the time of its meeting.

Then he goes on to point out the fact that these statements are not the result of theoretical speculation, but that prior to 1821 no fewer than 18 acts were passed by Congress appointing a different day for its meeting from that stipulated in the Constitution. I ask unanimous consent that his complete statement may be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit A.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I regret the argument used by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] that Members of the Senate should vote against my amendment because forsooth I introduced it, who was opposed and one of the very few persons opposed to the joint resolution as introduced by the Senator from Nebraska. That argumentum ad hominem, if I may be permitted to refer to something out of the old logic book which I once studied, is one which I think should not apply to an amendment to the Constitution. Either it should stand on its own merits or not. The fact that I introduced it ought not to count against it or in its favor.

It was adopted at length in the House and adopted by a very considerable majority. I think it is a reasonable amendment. It provides a five months' short session instead of what is at the present time practically a two months' short session. It in no way affects the "lame-duck" amendment. It in no way affects the curious situation whereby a Congressman elected in November does not

take his seat until a year from the following December. I hope very much that it may stand on its merits and that something may be done to prevent the things pointed out by former Speaker Longworth and by Mr. GLOVER.

As a matter of fact, if my recollection serves me—it has been called in question by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] and therefore I am a little bit afraid to refer to it—there was a filibuster conducted by the distinguished Senators from Arizona [Mr. Ashurst and Mr. Hayden] on behalf of their State during a long session of Congress in which we had many daily sessions devoted to the consideration of the Boulder Dam question. There are times when there is no way in which a small State or a small group of States can protect what they believe to be their rights in connection with undesirable legislation other than by an effort to talk it to death, by taking up a lot of time and, in other words, conducting a filibuster. Once the Senate decides that that is an undesirable proceeding, it can be changed by rule. Under Rule XXII, once two-thirds of the Senate believe any legislation should be passed without further talk, it can be done and no great harm done.

Mr. President, I very much hope the amendment may be adopted.

EXHIBIT A

The time of meetings of Congress: In public discussions of the proposed Norris "lame-duck" amendment and in demands by Members of Congress for special sessions to meet temporary emergencies, the fact is often overlooked that Congress itself has the power to regulate the time of its meeting. The fourth section of Article IV of the Constitution provides: "The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by law appoint a different day." Under this provision the much-criticized rush of bills in the short session could easily be averted by an act convening Congress at an earlier date than the first Monday in December. So, too, a Congress whose final session was coming to a close could provide that its successor should meet immediately, instead of waiting until the following December. A Congress desirous of a special session on a problem like unemployment could call such a session irrespective of lack of action by the President, provided it could command a majority sufficient to override a possible presidential veto. Of course such action could be taken only while Congress was in session, because, under the provisions of the Constitution, the President is the only person who, between sessions, is empowered to call special sessions.

These statements are not the result of theoretical speculation, but rest firmly on the facts of our legislative history. Prior to 1821 no fewer than 18 acts were passed by Congress appointing a different day for its meetings from that stipulated in the Constitution. Before referring to these acts more in detail, it would perhaps clarify matters somewhat to recall to mind how March 4 was decided upon as a limit of presidential and congressional terms. Article VII of the Constitution provided that the instrument should go into effect when ratified by nine States. This was accomplished on June 21, 1788. In a resolution of September 13, 1788, the Congress of the Confederation, after providing dates for the choice of electors and the election of a President, set the first Wednesday in the following March as the time "for commencing the proceedings under said Constitution." The first Wednesday in March, 1789, fell on March 4. Lack of a quorum until April 6 prevented the counting of the electoral vote, and it was not until April 30 that Washington was inaugurated President. However, Congress decided that both congressional and presidential terms had begun on March 4, 1789, and by act of March 1, 1792, set March 4, 1793, as the date for the beginning of the next presidential term.

The First Congress adjourned its first session on September 29, 1789, but before doing so passed an act setting January 4, 1790, as the date of the beginning of its next session. This session ended on August 12, and, no further action being taken, the third session commenced on December 6, 1790, in accordance with the constitutional provision. A number of bills were introduced in the session with respect to the next meeting of Congress, and eventually by act of March 2, 1791, the date was set for the fourth Monday in October, 1791, more than a month before the date provided for in the Constitution. The precedent here established was followed with considerable frequency. The favorite date was the first Monday in November, no less than 10 of the 18 laws passed prior to 1821 selecting that day. The second, third, and fourth Mondays in November were also chosen, as were the fourth and last Mondays in October. Twice during this period—in 1809 and in 1813—the beginning of the short session was set by law for the fourth Monday in May. It is also worthy of note that nearly half of the acts passed by Congress related to the long session, emphasizing the fact that Congress was concerned not merely with the brevity of the short session. The calling of the first session of a Congress at an earlier date than that set by the Constitution shortened the period between the election of members and their active participation in legislation, thus meeting much of the criticism made against that situation.

Several questions of constitutional interpretation arose in connection with these laws. For example, the act of March 3, 1797, had fixed as the date of the meeting of the Fifth Congress the first Monday in November, 1797. But President John Adams called a special session for May 15. When this Congress met the question was raised whether the act passed at the last session fixing the date of the next meeting of Congress as the first Monday in November had not been superseded by the calling of the special session. Opponents of this interpretation held that although the President had power to call extra sessions, it was the business of Congress to fix the dates of annual meetings, and, therefore, the two powers could not be allowed to infringe upon each other. However, in order to avoid any misunderstanding on the subject a new law was passed fixing the meeting of Congress on the second Monday in November, with a clause repealing the former act. Many Members of Congress did not believe the new act was necessary and opposed it on the ground that to take such action would give the President the power to repeal a law and to do away with the provisions of the Constitution of this subject.

The special session called by President Adams met on May 15 and adjourned on July 10, 1797, and the regular session met on November 13, in accordance with the act passed by Congress. But what would happen if a special session called by the President had not completed its business prior to the date set for the next annual session? It was not long before this contingency arose. By the act of March 3, 1803, Congress provided that the next meeting should be on the first Monday of the following November. President Jefferson, however, called the Eighth Congress into special session on October 17, and Congress remained in session until March 27, 1804, thus continuing without a break through November 7, the date set by Congress, and through Monday, December 5, the day appointed by the Constitution for the regular annual session.

Nor was this a solitary instance. The first meeting of the Tenth Congress was convened by proclamation of President Jefferson on October 26, 1807, and remained in session until April 2, 1808, without any interruption on Monday, December 7, the constitutional day of meeting. The same was true of the Twelfth Congress, which was convened by proclamation of President Madison on November 4, 1811, and continued in session until July 6, 1812. Again, at the second session of the Thirteenth Congress a law was passed and approved April 18, 1814, setting the last Monday in November of that year for the next meeting of Congress. But a special session was called by President Madison for September 19, 1814, and it, too, continued through the day appointed by law and by the Constitution for the beginning of the session. The reports of proceedings in Congress fail to disclose any discussions of constitutional problems here involved. If there were any questions in the minds of Members concerning distinctions between regular sessions of Congress and special ones called by presidential proclamation, presumably they were not raised.

This practice, however, was not allowed to continue, and it was later established that a special session, whether convened by law or by proclamation, ends with the day set by the Constitution for the annual meeting. During the quarrel between Congress and President Johnson Congress passed an act, approved by the President on January 22, 1867, because he realized his veto would be futile, providing that "in addition to the present regular times of meeting of Congress there shall be a meeting of the Fortieth Congress of the United States and of each succeeding Congress thereafter at 12 o'clock meridian on the 4th day of March, the day on which the term begins for which the Congress is elected. The Fortieth Congress, convened under this law, was still in session when the day approached for the regular annual meeting. A resolution was passed by both Houses that the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House should adjourn their respective Houses without day on Monday, December 2, at 12 o'clock. In accordance with this concurrent resolution, on Monday, December 2, the presiding officers of the two Houses declared the Houses adjourned sine die. Immediately thereafter the Houses were called to order in the second session. The act of January 22, 1867, which applied to three Congresses—the Fortieth, Forty-first, and Forty-second—was repealed April 20, 1871.

On October 15, 1877, the Forty-fifth Congress met in special session on the call of President Hayes, and it remained in session until December 3, the day appointed by the Constitution for the regular meeting of Congress. During the morning session on December 3, by concurrent resolution it was resolved to be the judgment of the two Houses that the current session of Congress expired by operation of law at 12 o'clock meridian on that day. The two Houses then agreed to the usual resolution authorizing the appointment of a joint committee to wait on the President and inform him of the adjournment. At 12 o'clock the new session was called.

The precedent here established was followed in later sessions. In the Fifty-eighth Congress President Roosevelt called a special session for November 9, 1903. The House adjourned on Saturday, December 6, but the Senate was still in session on Monday, December 7. At 12 o'clock on that day the President pro tempore of the Senate announced that the hour provided by law for the meeting of the first regular session of the Fifty-eighth Congress had arrived and declared the extraordinary session adjourned sine die. Immediately the Senate was called to order in regular session, as was also the House, and the second session of the Fifty-eighth Congress commenced. Almost identical action was taken by the Sixty-third Congress, when called into special session by

President Wilson on April 7, the session continuing to Monday, December 1, when it was adjourned in order that the regular session might commence.

The stand here taken by Congress is an important one in the maintenance of the theory of the separation of powers in our National Government. If no distinction were made between special sessions called by the President and regular sessions provided by the Constitution, and if special sessions were to extend over the date set for regular meetings, the President would be able to exert undue pressure on the legislative branch of the Government. On the other hand, the action of Congress in its conflict with President Johnson illustrates the extent of its power to meet practically continuously, provided it has sufficient strength to override the presidential veto.

An attempt of the Twenty-fourth Congress, in 1836, to fix the date of the annual meeting of Congress on the first Monday in November in every year was vetoed by President Jackson because the same act contained a provision fixing the second Monday of May as the day of adjournment of the first session of all succeeding Congresses. Jackson admitted without question the power of Congress to fix, by law, a day for its regular annual session. But the attempt to set a definite date for the adjournment of all succeeding Congresses he regarded as unconstitutional.

It is interesting to note that, in contrast with the frequent acts of Congress prior to 1821 changing the dates of its meetings, only one law for that purpose has been passed since 1821. This was the act of January 22, 1867, which, as already noted, grew out of Congress' distrust of President Johnson. In recent years Congress has seemed content to let the President call special sessions rather than exercise its power to change the date of its meetings. Undoubtedly the development of the party system and of the party leadership of the President has had much to do with the present situation. But the fact remains that Congress has the power to change its times of meeting, just as it did so often in its earlier history. A constitutional amendment is not necessary to enable a newly elected Congress to meet for its first session on, or immediately after, March 4 following its election or to enable Congress to fix the dates of annual sessions. A change in the date of the inauguration of the President or of the beginning of the terms of Congressmen would require a constitutional amendment, and it is, perhaps, the combination of these provisions with the sessions of Congress in the Norris proposals which has obscured somewhat the real power of Congress over the time of its own meetings.

EVERETT S. BROWN.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no desire to detain the Senate more than a few moments. In the first place, I doubt very seriously whether the framers of our Constitution ever contemplated what we know as the short session of Congress. While in the original document they provided that Congress should meet on the first Monday in December every year, they likewise provided that the Government of the United States which was to be formed under that Constitution should not begin operation until certain preliminary things had occurred that enabled it to be represented not only in its legislative branches but in its executive department likewise.

The Constitution which had been framed by the Philadelphia convention had to be submitted to all the States, and there was no way to know how long it would require to secure its adoption. It provided that 9 of the 13 States should adopt it or ratify it before it could become effective. There was no way to foresee when the ratification by the ninth State would transpire. Then it provided for a series of events that should occur after the final ratification, including the election of Members of Congress and including the selection of members of the Electoral College who were to elect a President, all of whom had to be elected before the Government could begin operation. It so happened that the last date fell on the 4th day of March. There is nothing in the Constitution about the 4th day of March. There is nothing in the Constitution about a short session. After reading the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention and the amendments and motions offered by members of it, it is my conclusion, and the conclusion, I think, also of many able writers on the Constitution, that the convention really meant that the first session which should be held after the adoption of the Constitution and inauguration of the Government should be in the December following the November election, instead of the December, 13 months later.

But in view of the fact that a series of accidental occurrences brought the date for the beginning of the Government over to the 4th day of March, which was nowhere mentioned in the Constitution, and therefore, by long practice

and finally by consummation of statute, the 4th day of March was fixed as the date when new terms should begin, not only for the President of the United States but for Members of Congress, it transpired that Members elected in November did not take their seats until the following March, and, therefore, the first session of Congress which could be held after that date necessarily had to be the following December, which was 13 months after they were elected. I do not believe it was ever the intention of the framers of the Constitution that there should be any legal distinction between the first and second sessions of the Congress of the United States. So much for that.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that it was not, in my judgment, the intention of the framers of the Constitution to limit any session of Congress by fixing an arbitrary date of adjournment it seems to me that it would be presumption on our part that we possess more wisdom than any future Congress can possibly possess with reference to the date when it ought to adjourn. I do not believe we possess any greater wisdom than Congresses that may meet hereafter will possess. I do not believe it is within our province, nor is it within our duty or our wisdom or our ability, to foresee the future events of our country and say to any future Congress that they shall stay in session three months or four months or five months or any other limited time. We ought to leave it to them. I think the chances are they will have as much vision as we have. I think the chances are fair that they will be as intelligent as we are.

I certainly think, in view of the changing exigencies of our country, the multiplication of the duties of Congress, the vast ramifications of all the activities with which we are compelled to deal, that it is certainly unwise to say to any Congress that may meet 100 years from now: "Whether you have finished your business or not you must adjourn on the 4th day of some March," because forsooth we desire to get out early in the year of election in order that we may devote ourselves to our campaign for reelection. It is not a matter of any importance, in my judgment, compared to the fundamental law of our country with reference to the fixing of dates for sessions of Congress to begin or terms of office to begin. Therefore I hope the amendment will be defeated and that we will at least leave it to the discretion and judgment and wisdom of Congresses which are to meet in the years to come to determine when they shall finish their duties, and allow them to leave it to their constituents as to whether they have acted wisely or unwisely.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I notice that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], in speaking against the amendment, suggested that it was an amendment presented by enemies of the measure. I want to say that if there is anyone in the Senate who is anxious to see this joint resolution become a part of the Constitution it is myself. But that does not preclude me, I hope, as a friend of constitutional government, from supporting an amendment that is wise, even though it may come from those who may have opposed the resolution in the past. If my memory serves me correctly, the resolution as reported to the Senate some years ago contained a limitation as to the time when the second session should adjourn. I may be wrong in that, but that is my recollection of the matter. The friends of the measure then, as I recall, did not feel that it was so terribly dangerous.

I believe Senators do not consider what it will mean to bring a Congress to a close when there is no opportunity to pass upon bills in which they are interested after they have voted for final adjournment. In every instance in the past when Congress adjourned voluntarily there has always been the next session of Congress at which the bills may be considered. It is only because the Constitution itself compels adjournment on the 4th of March that we have had to adjourn on that date.

I recognize the objections to filibusters. I recognize, it is possible that there will be filibusters even if the sessions run for five months. But I believe that an orderly government should not have the legislative body in session continuously. I believe there ought to be a time when the

work of the legislative body would come to a close in the year in which politics is uppermost in the minds of both the executive and the legislative branches of the Government. I think when we allow an unlimited time for the first session and allow approximately five months for the second session we are not endangering the country, as the Senator from Nebraska suggests.

Let me say also that I believe the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut will hasten the submission of the constitutional amendment to the States by the House of Representatives. I recall that in the last session, when the House voted for the resolution and the matter went to conference, I stated then that I hoped the Senate would reach a compromise. I believe in the proposal as a matter of principle, and I believe the custom forced upon us by the present system of Congressmen and Senators not taking their seats and beginning their duties for 13 months after election is so hurtful to the working of popular government that this is a matter of not such great importance in comparison.

I believe, therefore, that if the amendment limiting the time to June 4 shall be adopted, the joint resolution will go through the House without any amendment whatsoever; that it will be submitted to the States and ratified probably more quickly than any amendment that has ever been submitted. On the other hand, if we do not adopt it, the House of Representatives will probably do what it did before and we shall find ourselves tied up in another conference jam, with no resolution submitted to the States, and the present objectionable situation continued.

Personally I am not worried about filibusters. I have seen a number of filibusters and I have read of a good many others. It has been my observation that very little legislation that the country really wanted and especially that the country really needed has been prevented of passage by filibuster. Any important legislation that has been prevented by the closing of the Congress on the 4th of March or by a filibuster has been very properly and quickly passed by the Congress that met in the following December. The fact of the matter is the country has been saved much legislation from which, in my judgment, it should have been saved by the fact that the Congress was compelled to adjourn on the 4th day of March.

It sounds very well for Senators to say that Congress has so much judgment that it may be depended upon always to adjourn when the best interests of the country demand, but our history does not seem to justify that statement.

Furthermore, when we allow five months from the meeting of the second session during which Congress may legislate we have not hampered it in the matter of time. For that reason, I intend to support the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], and, of course, if it shall be defeated, I shall support the joint resolution, and I hope that it will be passed by the House of Representatives at an early date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM].

Mr. BINGHAM. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McNARY. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. BINGHAM. Very well, I withdraw the suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The suggestion of the absence of a quorum is withdrawn, and the yeas and nays are demanded. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I understand, however, that on this vote I am released from that pair. Therefore I am permitted to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. KENDRICK (when Mr. CAREY's name was called). On this vote my colleague [Mr. CAREY], who is unavoidably absent, is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY].

Mr. HASTINGS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). As previously announced, I am paired for the day with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. I do not know how he would vote on this question. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD]. He being absent, and not knowing how he would vote, and being unable to secure a transfer, I withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. In his absence, and not knowing how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] and therefore withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES. I find that on this question I can transfer my pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL]. I do so and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. KING. On this vote I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and vote "nay."

Mr. BYRNES. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. McKELLAR (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND], who, it seems, is not present. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and allow my vote to stand.

While I am on my feet, I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is unavoidably absent and is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED].

Mr. MOSES. I find that I may transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] to the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT]. I make that transfer and vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 47, as follows:

| YEAS—18 | | | |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Austin | Fess | Kean | Patterson |
| Barbour | Glenn | Keyes | Tydings |
| Bingham | Goldsborough | Lewis | White |
| Dickinson | Hale | Metcalf | |
| Dill | Hebert | Moses | |
| NAYS—47 | | | |
| Barkley | Couzens | Hull | Norris |
| Blaine | Cutting | Johnson | Nye |
| Borah | Dale | Jones | Sheppard |
| Bratton | Davis | Kendrick | Shipstead |
| Brookhart | Fletcher | La Follette | Shortridge |
| Bulow | Frazier | Logan | Steiwer |
| Capper | George | McGill | Thomas, Idaho |
| Caraway | Gore | McKellar | Thomas, Okla. |
| Connally | Harris | McNary | Wagner |
| Coolidge | Hatfield | Morrison | Walsh, Mont. |
| Copeland | Hawes | Neely | Wheeler |
| Costigan | Hayden | Norbeck | |
| NOT VOTING—30 | | | |
| Ashurst | Glass | Robinson, Ark. | Trammell |
| Bailey | Harrison | Robinson, Ind. | Vandenberg |
| Bankhead | Hastings | Schall | Walcott |
| Black | Howell | Smith | Walsh, Mass. |
| Broussard | King | Smoot | Waterman |
| Bulkley | Oddie | Stephens | Watson |
| Byrnes | Pittman | Swanson | |
| Carey | Reed | Townsend | |

So Mr. BINGHAM's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment, the joint resolution will be ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and read the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. NORRIS and Mr. McKELLAR called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. In his absence, and being unable to obtain a transfer, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. BYRNES (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE]. I understand that if present he would vote "yea." As I intend to vote the same way, I feel at liberty to vote and vote "yea."

Mr. KENDRICK (when Mr. CAREY's name was called). Once more I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CAREY] and to say that he is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY].

Mr. HASTINGS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I understand that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], with whom I am paired for the day, would vote as I shall vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KING (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. McKELLAR (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND], which I transfer to the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS], who is detained at his home by illness. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I expect to vote. Therefore I am free to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. I understand that if present he would vote as I have voted, and I therefore allow my vote to stand.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. HOWELL]. If he were present, he would vote "yea" on this question.

Mr. BINGHAM. The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], with whom I have a general pair, is detained on business of the Senate and is unable to be present. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. I transfer the pair which I have heretofore announced with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN] to the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] are necessarily detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 7, as follows:

YEAS—63

| | | | |
|-----------|-----------|----------|-------------|
| Ashurst | Caraway | Fletcher | Johnson |
| Austin | Connally | Frazier | Jones |
| Barbour | Coolidge | George | Kean |
| Barkley | Copeland | Glenn | Kendrick |
| Blaine | Costigan | Gore | Keyes |
| Borah | Couzens | Hale | La Follette |
| Bratton | Cutting | Harris | Lewis |
| Brookhart | Davis | Hatfield | Logan |
| Bulow | Dickinson | Hawes | McGill |
| Byrnes | Dill | Hayden | McKellar |
| Capper | Fess | Hull | McNary |

| | | | |
|----------|----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Morrison | Robinson, Ark. | Thomas, Idaho | Walsh, Mass. |
| Neely | Robinson, Ind. | Thomas, Okla. | Walsh, Mont. |
| Norbeck | Sheppard | Tydings | Wheeler |
| Norris | Shipstead | Vandenberg | White |
| Nye | Steiwer | Wagner | |

NAYS—7

| | | | |
|--------------|---------|-----------|--------|
| Dale | Hebert | Patterson | Watson |
| Goldsborough | Metcalf | Smith | |

NOT VOTING—25

| | | | |
|-----------|----------|------------|----------|
| Bailey | Glass | Pittman | Townsend |
| Bankhead | Harrison | Reed | Trammell |
| Bingham | Hastings | Schall | Walcott |
| Black | Howell | Shortridge | Waterman |
| Broussard | King | Smoot | |
| Bulkley | Moses | Stephens | |
| Carey | Oddie | Swanson | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas are 63, the nays are 7. More than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution is passing.

The joint resolution as passed is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following amendment of the Constitution be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid as a part of said Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of the several States as provided by the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The terms of the President and Vice President shall end at noon on the 15th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 2d day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 2d day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

"SEC. 3. If the House of Representatives has not chosen a President, whenever the right of choice devolves upon them, before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, then the Vice President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President. The Congress shall by law provide for the case of the failure to choose the Vice President before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly until the House of Representatives chooses a President or until the Senate chooses a Vice President.

"SEC. 4. This amendment shall take effect on the 15th day of October after its ratification."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McNARY obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. McNARY. I yield for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that when I made the motion to proceed with the consideration of the joint resolution that has just passed I announced that I should thereafter make a motion to proceed to the election of a President pro tempore.

Mr. McNARY. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will be willing to defer his motion for another day. I promised a number of Members of the Senate that we should have an executive session preceding this vote. I can not yield for the purpose the Senator mentions.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will let it go over, then, for the present; but I desire, of course, to carry out that statement made in good faith.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. MOSES, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably certain nominations for the calendar.

Mr. DILL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably, for the calendar, the nomination of Leroy M. Sullivan, of Alaska, to be United States attorney, district of Alaska, division No. 2.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the calendar is in order.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James M. Morton, jr., of Massachusetts, to be circuit judge, first circuit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination? [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Knight to be district judge, western district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination? [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William F. Rampendahl to be United States attorney, eastern district of Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination? [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward W. Wells to be United States attorney, eastern district of Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination? [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

The Senate resumed legislative session.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION ON COORDINATION OF MOTOR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. METCALF. I ask to have printed as a document the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission on the coordination of motor transportation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 7, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 6, 1932

CIRCUIT JUDGE

James M. Morton, jr., to be circuit judge, first circuit.

DISTRICT JUDGE

John Knight to be district judge, western district of New York.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

William F. Rampendahl to be United States attorney, eastern district of Oklahoma.

Edward W. Wells to be United States attorney, eastern district of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We are grateful, blessed Lord God, that our thoughts go along the way of life. We are blest with the mercy of understanding, though sometimes we are unwise. We are not children of darkness, though sometimes we sit in the shadows. We praise Thee that the world to us is a call to service and life. Grant us such a warmth of soul, such a sense of God speaking within that we shall breathe a new consciousness that Thou art our Father. Bless us with the simplicity of childhood that we may know that the highway of a good inspirational life is the way of love and trust. In the name of Jesus we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, this is Calendar Wednesday, and, as I understand, there are no bills on the calendar for consideration to be called up at this time. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that business on the Calendar Wednesday calendar be dispensed with to-day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we start off now with the objections that are made every session. Nobody knows it better than the distinguished gentleman who now graces the chair. In fact, there was a great deal of discussion whether the rules ought to be changed with regard to that. Naturally, this is the first Wednesday, and I suppose there is no committee ready on the call, but I think it is well that all chairmen of committees and all committees know that hereafter there will be objections made to suspending Calendar Wednesday, so that we will not hear the same old cry and the same old story, which is justified, that at the end of the session the committees have not had their call. Does the gentleman know which would be the first committee?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I doubt very much whether they have anything, but I am sure the gentleman from Alabama agrees with me.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, I agree with what the gentleman has said, that we should, as far as possible, preserve the integrity of Calendar Wednesday, and go forward with the business of the committees, but, as the gentleman recognizes, this is the beginning of the session, and there is no business that is urgent to be reported by any committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' WAGE REDUCTION AND GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, at the request of several Members I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a short letter which I have written to the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in regard to expenditures and revenues of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

JANUARY 4, 1932.

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN,

Chairman Committee on Expenditures.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The press announces you are this week calling before your committee colleagues who have introduced bills drastically curtailing the incomes of many thousands of Federal employees, offered on a plea that they are justified by Federal Budget conditions.

The testimony of witnesses necessarily involves their understanding of sacrifices and disastrous effect of proposed reductions on modest incomes, in many cases pledged long in advance by thousands of such employees. One of the eminent witnesses offering the proposal states in his biography he is director and treasurer of three large business concerns and also president of a bank, while another able colleague with a like proposition opened up a prosperous oil field which bears his name and has other large business interests.

Everyone congratulates these witnesses on their good fortune, but with large outside incomes they may have no fair conception of conditions confronted by those depending on a modest stipend with which to meet living conditions and other obligations. The latter army of employees no doubt would gladly pay large income taxes if similarly situated, at rates now less than one-half those levied by other countries seeking to balance their budgets.

The problem presented is contrary to a policy of granting fairly liberal exemptions to small incomes, largely secured through the active aid of the present Speaker of the House with the tacit consent of the Treasury Department. A serious objection is urged against any Pecksniff salary-shaving policy when shown that under the present system of congressional extravagance our national annual appropriations have increased in the past 20 years from about \$726,400,000 in 1911 to \$4,220,000,000 in 1931, in round numbers, or nearly a 500 per cent increase, whereas the population increased only about 15 per cent in that same period. Extravagant Federal subsidies to various favored interests have also been responsible in part for heavy tax burdens borne by the States and

by every taxpayer, all of which can be set forth more specifically, if desired.

The same press notice of income cutting of Government employees carries headlines that the House Naval Committee is to urge a new \$700,000,000 naval building program to include 120 war vessels, some of which are to replace ships that become obsolete in a few years and are then sunk as targets to secure parity with Great Britain. No more danger of war is apprehended from Great Britain than from Canada or Cuba, but it offers a good excuse to the great navy propagandist.

Reference to the same 20-year increase in national expenditures gives \$308,522,579 for War and Navy bills in 1911 and \$843,312,839 in 1931, or upwards of nearly a billion dollars now annually for war apart from the enormous naval program, just presented. All in times of peace following a war to end wars, in which we expended some \$30,000,000,000 or more to attain that end, and yet to-day are threatened with repudiation of international debts reaching \$11,000,000,000 loaned to our Allies. War programs disclose the stupendously extravagant policy now pursued by Congress in the hands of its "war" advisers, following pressure by ship-building companies formerly represented by Mr. Shearer, navy yard, or other interests.

Closely allied to this question is a recent charge by a high naval authority of the House that we are cultivating a great flock of naval butterflies at Newport and elsewhere, and the charge that the Secretary of the Navy sent 30 warships last summer to exploit a business venture on Long Island. To the latter charge the Secretary is reported by the press to have replied it is a custom to extend favors to those in a position to demand them. This is all a proper subject for congressional investigation, but relates to your committee because Congress should halt any increase of naval or military butterflies during present financial conditions. Also any proposed decrease of Federal employees' pay should extend to every officer of the Army or Navy, whether butterflies or hard-working employees, like many thousands of those whose service from 20 to 40 years with the Government is proposed now to be rewarded by drastic salary cuts. I believe several of my colleagues should be heard to this same effect before any report is seriously considered by your committee recommending either of the proposed bills.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. FREAR.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6660) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the first deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. MOREHEAD in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

The amount authorized to be deducted from appropriations for the fiscal year 1932 for the Indian Service and placed to the credit of the appropriation for contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, for the purchase of stationery supplies, is hereby increased from \$50,000 to \$60,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on page 15, line 13, I move to strike out the words "for the fiscal year 1932."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 15, line 13, strike out the words "for the fiscal year 1932."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, during this year our people back home, in large numbers, are expecting to come to Washington. School children by the thousands will visit here. Just now in Washington we have one of the best taxicab services ever known in our history. You can get in a taxicab now and ride anywhere in the city proper for 20 cents. The street railways, which for so long robbed the people here with a 10-cent fare, have lost much of their patronage. Because of the influence of the electric-railway system in Washington and their subsidiary bus lines in Washington the Public Utilities Commission, which just now is composed of one man, has been prevailed upon to order that all of these 20-cent taxicabs be taken off the streets of Washington, in that all taxicabs next Saturday must be put back upon a meter basis.

I want to call to your attention what is going to happen. The other evening I had occasion to drive out into the northwest section of the city, close to the Roosevelt Hotel. I ordered a taxicab. I thought it was a 20-cent taxicab. I did not know you could miss one, there are so many of them. By mistake I got into a meter car, and when I got out I handed him a dollar bill and he gave me back 10 cents, and he expected me to give him that 10 cents for a tip. He charged me 90 cents instead of 20 cents. If meter cars now will charge a Member of Congress 90 cents to take him where there are 1,500 twenty-cent taxicabs anxious to take him for 20 cents, what will they do if they are put back on a meter basis?

They are planning to rob the people of this Nation who this year are to come to Washington to attend the George Washington Bicentennial celebration, for which we are now making preparation. General Patrick is the man who has ordered these taxicabs back to the meter system.

I think I speak the sentiments of the Members on the other side of this Capitol as well as of the Members of this House, when I say that we should give General Patrick to understand that Congress is not going to stand for returning to the meter system. Who is complaining? All of the 20-cent taxicabs are anxious to remain in business. They are willing to carry people for 20 cents. They are anxious to carry people for 20 cents. They are protesting the action of General Patrick in ordering them back to the meter system. Why should we go back to that system?

Hundreds of these deserving men who are driving these 20-cent taxicabs are ex-service men with wives and children to support. They could find no other job. They are making a living. Their families have shelter, clothing, food, fuel, and necessities of life. If they are run off the streets, which they will be if this order to go on a meter basis prevails, they will have no jobs and their wives and children will starve. They bravely served their flag and country during the war, and we must see that they get a square deal here in Washington.

There is no one else fostering this proposition other than the street-car companies, which for 15 years we have been trying to get back to their charter price of 5 cents, and which for so long we tried to keep from charging little school children 10 cents—70,000 Washington school children. They and the bus companies and the Black and White and Yellow Taxicab monopoly are the only ones who are pushing this meter proposition.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman will recall that when we did fix the rate for the school children they delayed putting it into effect for one month.

Mr. BLANTON. Why, certainly. If you will go to the depot right now, the Union Station, you will find the greatest monopoly that exists in the United States. There is just one taxicab company that can go into that depot, and when your people come here they must use those meter taxicabs. I hope that before this session adjourns this Congress will protect the rights of the people of this Nation and will stop the infamous taxicab monopoly that exists at our Union Station. [Applause.]

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. Should we not do something now and before it goes too far?

Mr. BLANTON. I have already prepared a resolution, and I am going to get Chairman BYRNS to offer it to-day, and if you will pass it unanimously, if Mr. Patrick has any sense at all, he will know that Congress is not going to allow him to put this over on the people, and he will withdraw his meter order.

Mr. PATTERSON. Let us impeach him.

Mr. BLANTON. He ought to understand the sentiment of this House right now, and if he persists in putting his order into effect after we pass this resolution, we can then take drastic action against him to stop it. The people here

are up in arms about it. It is not only unfair to the people of the District of Columbia but it will be unfair to all of the people in every one of the 435 districts of this Nation who will come to Washington during the year.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. BYRNS. I agree with every word the gentleman from Texas has said with reference to this matter. I want to ask him whether or not a date has been fixed when this order will go into effect?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. It is to go into effect next Saturday, unless the courts stop it by injunction.

Mr. BYRNS. I hope the gentleman will pass his resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. I was in conference this morning with corporation counsel, Mr. Bride.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. COLTON. Is it not true that under the order which has been made the taxicabs in the District will be forced to install meters?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. He has entered an order that on next Saturday they all shall install meters, and that means this, that if the meter taxies now charge a Member of Congress 90 cents to go from here to the Roosevelt Hotel when we have hundreds of 20-cent taxicabs available, that when they put the meter system back into force, and we have only meter cars, they will charge \$1.50 to go from here to the Roosevelt Hotel.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If the gentleman will get in his resolution, it will pass this House in two minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course it will. And I will get Chairman BYRNS to offer it and pass it to-day. The reason I have taken this time is that I wanted Mr. Patrick to understand that it is the universal sentiment of this House that he must retract that meter order, as we are not going to stand for it. [Applause.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Emergency reconstruction and fighting fires: For an additional amount for emergency reconstruction and fighting forest fires in national parks, fiscal year 1932, \$55,000: *Provided*, That these funds shall be available for reimbursement of park appropriations for the amounts transferred therefrom under the authority contained in the Interior Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1932.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I make this pro forma motion in order that I may get from the chairman of the committee some information concerning two items, one that was passed over on page 13, beginning in line 6, and the other in the section that has just been read, which is of a similar character, except that it refers to an emergency situation in connection with the park service. It seems to me that an item carrying the amount, for instance, of the one on page 13 ought not to go by without at least a word of explanation as to the necessity for it. I wish the chairman would give us some explanation of the emergency that makes this appropriation necessary.

Mr. BYRNS. I will say to the gentleman that in every annual bill there is an appropriation of \$100,000 for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to control forest fires if they break out. There have been years when very little of that sum has been used, and then there have been years when a great deal more has been needed. Whenever a fire occurs in any one of these great forests the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to use any other appropriation at his command for the purpose of putting out the fire and saving Government property. If the gentleman will read the hearings he will see that the Chief Forester explained at great length just why this large sum was needed. It is unusual; it is a greater sum than has been

needed for quite a while, and it is because of the fact that there were an unusually large number of fires last summer and last fall, which necessitated the Secretary of Agriculture using other appropriations. This is the amount of money actually expended by the Secretary of Agriculture for that purpose, and, of course, it is necessary to reimburse the funds from which he took the money.

Mr. KETCHAM. Then, it has no particular reference to any unusual fire expectation this year?

Mr. BYRNS. No; this money has already been expended.

Mr. KETCHAM. There were an unusual number of forest fires during the part of the year already expired.

Mr. BYRNS. The Chief Forester says it has been the worst season he has ever had, certainly in many years, so far as the number and extent of these fires are concerned.

If the gentleman will read the hearings, he will see the amount of territory that was burned and the value of the timber that was destroyed.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of bailiffs, etc: For additional amounts for bailiffs and criers, including the same objects specified under this head in the acts making appropriations for the Department of Justice for the following fiscal years:

For 1931, \$14,000;

For 1932, \$30,000.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want the attention of the chairman of the committee on this question of bailiffs in the district courts as provided on page 19 of the bill. I understand, of course, this is a deficiency appropriation; but what I want to direct the attention of the gentleman to is this. I do not know the condition in the rural districts, but I do know that in the large cities these bailiffs are miserably paid. They are on a per diem basis. When the judges go on a vacation they are dropped. If the judges do not come down on Saturday, they are not paid for that day. I am sure the gentleman will admit that for five days a week paying the bailiff of a court \$25 a week and then not paying him for the summer months when the judge is away is rather unbecoming the dignity of a Federal court.

I wonder if the gentleman will take this matter up when we have up the regular appropriation bill for the Department of Justice and see if we can not do something for these underpaid employees. It is a terrible situation, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS. I am very sure the subcommittee which has charge of that bill will be pleased to do that, especially when they learn of the request made by the gentleman from New York. There has been considerable agitation, I may say to the gentleman, about doing away with the bailiffs. There are some of us who do not know just why they are needed.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. They are attendants of the court.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; and I may have confused criers with bailiffs.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The bailiffs, of course, are officers of the court.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I had one instance, which we need not bring up at this time, in a certain district not very far from the section of the country that the gentleman represents, where the bailiff was the butler in the home of the judge. I am not talking about such instances, but where they do work in the courts as they do in the large cities, if we are going to have them, let us pay them; and if they are not necessary, let us abolish such positions. I hope the gentleman's committee will give some consideration to this question.

Mr. BYRNS. I am quite sure the committee will do that, and I shall call their attention to the gentleman's statement.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SUPERVISING ARCHITECT

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS: Page 24, after line 22, insert:

"Fort Worth, Tex., narcotic farm: For acquisition of site under the authority of the act entitled 'An act to establish two United States narcotic farms for the confinement and treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming narcotic drugs who have been convicted of offenses against the United States, and for other purposes,' approved January 19, 1929 (U. S. C., Supp. V., secs. 222, 223), \$164,780, to remain available until June 30, 1933."

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, this estimate came to the House too late to be incorporated in this bill. It reached the House on January 4. It was obtained entirely through the insistence and very earnest activity and attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], and I am going to ask him to explain to the House the necessity for its inclusion in the pending bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, in January, 1929, an act was passed authorizing the construction of two institutions for the care of persons addicted to habit-forming drugs who had been convicted of offenses against the United States. Provision was made for one of these institutions east of the Mississippi River and one west of the Mississippi. The selection of the sites was left to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Attorney General.

The site east of the Mississippi was selected at Lexington, Ky., and appropriation has already been made for that institution. The selection west of the Mississippi was made at Fort Worth, Tex., on land which was offered by the chamber of commerce of that city and which, after inspection of all the sites over the country offered and available, the committee decided to be the most admirably adapted to the purposes of the measure.

Consequently the committee decided and announced that this site would be selected, whereupon the chamber of commerce of the city acquired the land.

As stated by the Director of the Budget, a contract has been entered into, in so far as the good faith of the Government is concerned. The chamber of commerce, acting upon this authorization from the committee and this selection, acquired the land and is holding the same; and this item in the amendment is simply to pay for the land; and the Government, it seems, is honor bound, after this selection, to do this.

This does not provide for immediate construction, the Government wishing to see and study first some of the details of the construction at the narcotic farm at Lexington, Ky., in order that it may profit by the experience in the construction at Fort Worth. This item, therefore, provides for no construction but is simply to pay an obligation which has been incurred there for the Government, upon the Government's selection, at the expense of private individuals.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I am going to direct my remarks to the next section in this bill, because under the parliamentary situation there may not be much discussion about it.

I want to state to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] that my move on the next section, I hope, will not be taken by him as taking an unfair advantage on my part. What little I know of parliamentary procedure I have learned from the gentleman from Tennessee and from other great parliamentarians here.

A great deal has been said about the architectural beauty of the particular school of architecture that the State Department Building partakes of.

I am not going into the æsthetic side to-day. We are in no temper to make an appeal to the spiritual side of the question. I want to point out that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee yesterday very forcefully stated to the House that where the House has heretofore legislated on a

subject there is nothing left for the Committee on Appropriations to do but to carry out the mandate of the House.

We are in exactly the same position in reference to the remodeling of the State Department Building. That has already been accomplished; that is, the legislative side of it has been accomplished. An appropriation of \$3,000,000 was made July 3, 1930, and became a law. On the 10th of July, 1930, the architect signed a contract with the Treasury Department for this work and the preliminaries were completed November 8, 1930, and accepted and signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, Senator Smoor, the Supervising Architect, and so forth. After this was done the working drawings and specifications, ready for putting the job on the market, were delivered to the Treasury Department on the 19th of January, 1931, after having been approved by all of the different technical departments in the Supervising Architect's office and approved by the Fine Arts Commission.

The architect is now ready to put this work on the market immediately when, within a little over a month, it is possible to start this work. It has been carefully figured by stone experts and checked by quarrymen who have been consulted, and is found that when this work is started 750 stone cutters scattered in places far from Washington can start work. This is not the case with a great many appropriations which are not prepared to start as quickly as it is possible to do in this case. The 750 men referred to represent approximately 12 per cent of the members of the granite cutters' union of this country, and this work would be done far from Washington in some of the granite States and would extend over a period of approximately eight months. In addition to that, of course, granite cutters would have to be employed on the building cutting off and removing the old stone. Aside from this, in approximately four months from now, besides granite cutters, other trades would be employed on the building.

It is interesting to note that this type of work requires more hand labor relative to the cost than usual building operations.

In connection with the granite cutters' condition in this country, it is one of the worst now existing because of the fact that the proportion of granite now used is so small relative to other stones, and there are approximately 40 per cent of the men in this union now unemployed.

Now, what will that do? I am going to make an appeal to the material side of the subject. It will employ 750 stonecutters for several months. It will employ several hundred masons for several months.

Let me quote from a letter from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, addressed to the architect's office in relation to this project. He says:

Labor is very impatient over the delay which has ensued in launching the Government's construction program. Unemployment is widespread, and the distress resulting therefrom is almost acute. What is needed most of all is the launching of the full and complete construction program of the Federal Government. Even the maximum amount of work which it will do will only serve to take up a partial amount of the slack of unemployment.

And he further says, referring to this particular building:

The most important would be the prompt and immediate beginning of the work of construction and changes.

Now, let me quote a word from the building trades department of the American Federation of Labor, with reference to the alteration and renovation of the State Building. Mr. M. J. McDonough, president of the building trades department of the American Federation of Labor, wrote on June 3, 1931, to Mr. Waddy B. Wood, architect:

It is a great pleasure to recommend the plan you have proposed for adoption, and to express the hope that the Government will agree to the execution of the contract as proposed.

Mr. William J. Spencer, secretary and treasurer of the building trades department of the American Federation of Labor, stated under date of May 28, 1931:

In the opinion of the writer the job proposed is essentially an emergency one; first for the reason that building conditions of the country absolutely demand that where appropriations either of public or private moneys are available for construction, the job to be covered by such an appropriation be started without

unnecessary delay. * * * What the country needs at this time is immediate action on all projects that entail building construction.

Arrangements have already been made concerning night work, so that the work would be carried on exclusively at night, not to disturb public business during the day. Labor has made a generous contribution. Mr. Sam Squibb, international president of the Granite Cutters' International Association of America, wrote on September 30, 1930, to Mr. Waddy B. Wood, architect:

Your first question is as to whether you are correct in assuming that if the granite cutters went on after the clerks left in the afternoon there would be no overtime, but there would be seven hours worked in place of the usual eight hours. In other words, the 8-hour day would be what you would pay for instead of the seven hours at night. You are correct in assuming that eight hours' pay would be required for seven hours' work, and all work done over the seven hours would be considered as overtime.

Now, this four months' work will not be done in the District of Columbia. The stone work will be done all over the country. The stone will in all likelihood be quarried in New England. There is plenty of unemployment there.

There is to be no discussion about this paragraph. The provision is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. BYRNS. I understood the gentleman to say in a little colloquy the other day that he was not going to oppose this under the circumstances, but to shut his eyes, and then he said jocularly to the gentleman from Nebraska that he would not shut his eyes to the inside. I am rather surprised that the gentleman is going to make a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I understand that the House has passed on this, and a limitation by the committee does not apply to this appropriation. It applies to appropriations heretofore made by Congress. Let me repeat what I have already said, at the risk of becoming tiresome, that it will give employment to 750 stone workers for at least four months. Then, too, a few hundred stone masons which surely will be recruited from several near-by States—all helpful in this period of unemployment. Why, if labor were scarce, the argument of economy might prevail. This is the typical kind of public work to stimulate business and alleviate unemployment. I do not know from whose district the stone will come, but some place in the United States. It will not be imported stone. Then there will be the work here. I have an architect's drawing of the remodeled building which I brought here particularly to show to my artistic friend from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I want my friend from Missouri to look at this some time during the day and when he sees the whole plan, with the remodeled building reflecting beauty as it does, with the setting of the White House between it and the Treasury, I am sure that he will be glad to remove his gingerbread style of architecture and put in its place something beautiful and artistic. So much for the æsthetic side; but the practical side is so pressing that I shall take the liberty of insisting upon the point of order. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will understand my position in the matter.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The question now under discussion was before the House on June 20, 1930, when the House was considering the question as to whether or not the State, War, and Navy Building should be remodeled, in fact wrecked and rebuilt, at an estimated cost of \$3,000,000. At that time I vigorously opposed this proposal as an indefensible waste of public funds, and an act of vandalism in the destruction of one of the most magnificent, well preserved, and valuable buildings in Washington. At that time the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] offered a motion to strike

out the provision authorizing this waste, extravagance, and spoliation. He was seeking to protect the Treasury from an unwarranted invasion and rape, and at the same time preserve one of the noblest types of architecture in the Nation. I was in harmony with his views, and I supported his amendment. My remarks on that occasion appear in the RECORD beginning on page 11369, volume 72, part 10, second session of the Seventy-first Congress, to which I invite the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA], as I believe he will there find not only persuasive but compelling reasons why this and the other buildings mentioned in this paragraph should not be destroyed.

In my former remarks I called attention to the fact that the State, War, and Navy Building represented possibly the most perfect example of the Italian Renaissance order of architecture in the western world; that it was one of the most splendid specimens of one of the eight great types or orders of architecture; that it had its origin in Italy, of which historic land the ancestors of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] were natives; that many of the most beautiful and most famous buildings in Italy, Spain, France, Belgium, Germany, and England are of this type, among which I mentioned the Ricardo Palace at Florence, the Chateau of Blois, the Louvre, the Tuileries, St. Peter's (Rome), the Luxembourg, the Hotel des Invalides, the Pantheon (Paris), St. Mark's Library (Venice), Blenheim Cathedral, and St. Paul's Cathedral (London), and that the two greatest architects of all time, Michelangelo, who built St. Peter's, and Sir Christopher Wren, who built St. Paul's Cathedral, would not have patterned them after the Renaissance order of architecture had it been an ugly and repugnant type, as the gentleman from New York would have us believe. I should hesitate to consider this historic type of architecture ugly, if it satisfied the æsthetic conceptions of Michelangelo and Sir Christopher Wren.

I said then, and I now repeat that while tastes differ, many of the most educated and cultured people in the United States and Europe admire, cherish, and venerate this order of architecture as one of the most perfect types conceived and created by the indomitable genius of man. It is a combination of the classic and Roman types, and after its adoption in the early part of the fifteenth century, it superseded the Gothic order of architecture, which had in turn succeeded the Corinthian, Ionic, and Doric, or Hellenic types, which were brought to their greatest perfection in ancient Greece and adjoining regions.

The gentleman from New York insists the State, War, and Navy Building is ugly. May I say that beauty is essentially a matter of taste and opinion. Rare beauty may exist without our having the faculties to recognize and appreciate it. Individuals, even able art critics, frequently differ as to what constitutes harmony, grandeur, and beauty. Beauty's choicest mirror is an admiring eye, and the beauty seen in a structure, picture, or person is largely in him who sees it, as beauty is not only objective but subjective. Theocritus says that beauty is a delightful prejudice. And Emerson says:

Though we travel the world over to find the beautiful, we must carry it with us or we find it not.

The yardstick by which my friend measures beauty may not be accepted as the inflexible standard by which architectural beauty and harmony are to be measured. Those who are endowed by nature with architectural genius, and who by a lifetime of study of the subject have established enduring fame as masters of architectural technique, may have conceptions of beauty at variance with those of the gentleman from New York. Great architects have not infrequently been in striking disagreement as to what constituted the most perfect type and examples of architecture, just as great painters have had their differences of opinion as to the most outstanding and perfect creations of the brush.

When I discussed this subject in June, 1930, I made an appeal that in the beautification of our National Capital we refrain from destroying any existing building of an outstanding architectural type, and that we do not confine our

building activities to the Hellenic or classic style, or any other particular order, but that in so far as practicable other great orders of architecture be utilized—types of buildings which the architectural genius of all ages of the world's history has created for the embellishment and enjoyment of succeeding ages, so that we may have here in Washington typical examples of all the great styles of architecture. The educational advantages of diversified architectural types in public buildings can not be overappraised.

Sir Christopher Wren, the famous architect, was very small in stature but he bequeathed to oncoming generations temples, cathedrals, and other structures that command the admiration of all people without regard to their culture or knowledge of architectural technique. His epitaph is on St. Paul's Cathedral, London, and is as follows:

If you seek his monument, look around you.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] is a very distinguished, able, and useful Member of this body. I regret that his artistic conceptions and knowledge of architectural technique are not commensurate with his skill and usefulness as a legislator. The gentleman's partiality for the classic, or Hellenic orders, of architecture probably blinds him to the beauty, symmetry, harmony, strength, and grandeur of the Romanesque, Gothic, or other great systems of architecture which appealed mightily to the æsthetic taste of men like Michelangelo, Christopher Wren, and other unchallenged monarchs in the realm of architecture. I am wondering how my friend from New York can harmonize his opinions with those of John Ruskin, probably the greatest master and critic of architecture and painting that the world has ever produced?

And may I say to my friend that in the United States and Europe there are among great architects two schools of thought and opinion, one insisting that all structures should conform to the classic, or Hellenic type, and the other recognizing the beauty, harmony, and grandeur of these and all other orders of architecture, the latter group protesting against the vandalism that would characterize the destruction of buildings like the State, War, and Navy Building, Post Office Department Building, and District of Columbia Building. The first is recognized as the most perfect example of the Italian Renaissance architecture in the western world, and one of the outstanding national monuments of all times; the second as an outstanding example of the Romanesque; and the third is a representation of the Hellenic, or classic type.

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. Lozier. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute in order to answer a question that the gentleman from New York wishes to propound.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was kind enough to refer to the artistic taste of my ancestors, and then tried to tie this State, War, and Navy Building, as it is now, with the school of architecture of the Italian Renaissance. I hope the gentleman will not be offended if I ask unanimous consent that he may revise his remarks so as not to connect this building with the beautiful description he gave of European architecture.

Mr. Lozier. I have only a cursory knowledge of architecture, although I have long been interested in the subject, and in a somewhat busy life I have found a little time to make a fitful, rambling, or desultory study of this most fascinating subject; and when, about two years ago, the proposal was advanced to remodel the State, War, and Navy Building so as to completely change its exterior appearance and architectural type I supplemented my superficial knowledge of architecture by a somewhat careful but, of course, desultory study in order to satisfy myself as to whether or not, even from an æsthetic standpoint, this splendid monument should be wrecked; and the more I investigated the more I became convinced that the proposal

to wreck and reconstruct the State, War, and Navy Building and destroy other buildings of other types was essentially and undeniably an inexcusable act of vandalism.

I will say to the gentleman from New York that many of the great buildings in Europe and America are either slight or substantial modifications of that type of architecture, of which the State, War, and Navy Building is an outstanding example.

Mr. LaGuardia. Oh, the gentleman is wrong in that respect.

Mr. Lozier. No; I am right in that respect. From an architectural or æsthetic stand point there is absolutely no reason for wrecking these buildings. From the standpoint of good business policy and common sense, I do not see how anyone can justify the wrecking of these colossal structures and the expenditure of many millions of dollars to construct others to replace them. Why should all our public buildings in Washington look alike, and be of the same type, so that when you have seen one, there is nothing different to be found in any of the others? But what is more important still, in this period of economic disaster, why destroy four magnificent public buildings that are as good as they were when first constructed, and which are adequately serving the Government, and spend millions of dollars of public money to build others not as commodious to replace them? [Applause.]

Mr. Arentz. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is rather difficult for one sitting in the House and listening to this debate to reconcile the policy expressed to-day by the majority with that of our plan to help in this crisis of unemployment by finding work for men in diversified activities through Government appropriation, as was referred to by the gentleman from New York. Now, we hear about economy on one hand and unemployment on the other hand. If the United States Government can not lead the way in this fight to curtail further unemployment of the workers of America, we can not expect the industrial leaders, the home owners, and small shop owners and tradesmen of America to lead the way.

In the letter from the American Federation of Labor, which was read by the gentleman from New York, Mr. Green speaks of the number of stonecutters that would be employed on this job. That is just the type of work, in my opinion, that should be provided for by the Government. The policy has been advocated by Senator La Follette to sell \$5,000,000,000 worth of bonds to carry on construction. I have stated from the outset that unless we can have the engineering work done, unless we can plan ahead, there is no use spending money for construction, because it would be wasteful and take too long to get under way, but here we have the plans already made. We have not only the blue prints made but we have the work laid out. All that would be necessary would be to appropriate this money to start to work hundreds of stonecutters and affiliated workmen.

Mr. LaGuardia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Arentz. I yield.

Mr. LaGuardia. The money is appropriated.

Mr. Arentz. I mean appropriated under the terms of this bill.

Mr. Cochran of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Arentz. I yield.

Mr. Cochran of Missouri. Would it not be better if we used the \$3,000,000 in constructing 30 buildings costing \$100,000 each, throughout the United States, rather than to destroy a building that it is not necessary to touch?

Mr. Arentz. If the gentleman will follow out the procedure in the construction of Government buildings throughout the various States of the Union, the gentleman will determine the same thing I have determined. In other words, it requires months and months to pick out the sites. It then requires months and months for the Supervising Architect to decide on plans, and then it requires months and months to ask for bids, and then after that the contractor takes his time before starting work, and a year or two has

elapsed, and I hope to God that by that time this depression will be over and we will not need to do this building.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Did the gentleman read my remarks yesterday where I stated that we have waited for four years to start our building in St. Louis, where the money is in the Treasury?

Mr. ARENTZ. We want something more tangible than that. We want the work started now so that the unemployed can go to work and not only think and speak about it.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Why not construct a new building and not destroy a good building? [Applause.]

Mr. ARENTZ. It is not my plan to destroy good buildings. Understand me, I have said nothing about destroying buildings, but I am in favor of getting work under way for which plans are made so that labor may be put to work at once, and unless the Members of this Congress do something to begin this work it will never start.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ARENTZ. I yield gladly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may not be clear as to what particular building or buildings the gentleman referred. Does the gentleman advocate tearing down such beautiful structures as the State, War and Navy Building just in order to put some stonecutters to work, whether or not there is a real need of such construction?

Mr. ARENTZ. Not at all. I have said nothing about tearing down buildings, but I do advocate carrying on certain changes for which the plans have been drawn and the money appropriated. I refer to the State, War, and Navy Building and the changes in its appearance contemplated. I say that sometime it must be changed, and the money has been appropriated and all arrangements made to start work, that work should be done now. The bankers and industrial leaders of Oklahoma are asking people to do their porch work, to do their kalsomining, to do their plastering, to put cement in their driveways, to make new sidewalks, and a thousand other things, which is the same identical thing as doing the work that is proposed to be done here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. But may I suggest that there are thousands of buildings that really should be constructed all over the United States and that this great city of Washington has heretofore received a lion's share of public buildings? There is real need for Federal buildings in every congressional district of the country, and the people would not be so particular about the type of architecture.

Mr. ARENTZ. Let us construct them, then. I am in favor of that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. What I am trying to impress on the gentleman is that rather than tear down magnificent and valuable structures like the State, War, and Navy Building, the Post Office, and Commerce Buildings, that the rest of the country should be given consideration on our public-building program.

Mr. ARENTZ. I am fully in favor of your plan for extensive construction now, to-day, when we have unemployment and not wait for next year or the year after.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Why not tear down the Capitol, the White House, and other old buildings and replace them with modern architecture, if the gentleman's argument be good; that is to say, if it is desired only to put men to work?

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENTZ. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Why does not the gentleman propose that the Post Office Building at Twelfth and D Streets be torn down? That is in the plans. That is mentioned, together with all these other buildings that are mentioned, including the Southern Railway Building. Why not have those torn down if it is simply to put men to work? I agree with the gentleman if that is the only matter, we should tear down all these buildings and put men to work.

Mr. ARENTZ. When the gentleman is speaking of the State, War, and Navy Building the gentleman is speaking about putting outside surface on the walls of it and changing the whole thing. When the gentleman speaks of de-

molishing the Southern Railway Building and the Post Office Building, the gentleman is speaking about something entirely different. They are not the same and I agree with him, but I do not go so far as to say we should tear down a useful building. The gentleman misunderstands me.

Mr. FREAR. Why should we do that except to put these men to work? If it is for the purpose of putting men to work, why not tear down all these buildings?

Mr. ARENTZ. If the gentleman's idea is—

Mr. FREAR. It is not my idea. It is the idea of the gentleman.

Mr. ARENTZ. It is not my idea at all, my friend.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, there has been quite a change in the personnel of this House since \$3,000,000 was voted to remodel the State, War, and Navy Building, and there has been quite a change in the condition of the country since this item was voted. At the time the money was appropriated by the House this country was in a far better condition than it is to-day. There was no deficit and the Congress was running wild making appropriations, with no thought that we would soon be facing a most serious depression. I can also say to the new Members who have come to this Congress that there was by no means a unanimous vote in appropriating the money to destroy this wonderful building. There was a powerful minority and this Hall was the scene of a bitter argument. My colleague Mr. LOZIER made a powerful speech in opposition. I opposed the appropriation then and oppose it now.

I say "destroy" because it means to reconstruct the building to conform to the architecture of the White House and other buildings in that vicinity. In my opinion, Washington is fast reaching the point where our public buildings are something like a circus. If you see one, you see them all.

The Commission of Fine Arts, or whatever you term it, as well as the architects of the country, have sold the idea to Government officials to have uniform buildings. Attractive, no doubt, but all alike. I am not in agreement with this program. Let us have something different now and then.

Now, I do not agree with the manner in which this building program has been proceeding. I showed yesterday in my remarks where we have waited for four years to start a building in St. Louis, where there are a hundred thousand people out of employment. If the Building Commission will devise a type of building suitable for a city of 50,000 population, a type of building for a city having 75,000 population, and a type for a city having a hundred thousand population and build the same type of building in cities of that size, you will expedite the building program. What difference does it make if you construct identical Federal buildings in cities in Maryland, Georgia, Maine, Colorado, and Oregon if the building meets the needs of the Government? Use the same plans and specifications, eliminate the architect in that way, which means a saving of money, and you will have done something worth while. You could have 20 buildings of the same character being constructed in different parts of the country at the same time from the same set of plans. Oh, I know this will not please some, but the big delay is with the architect. Of course, this can not be done when it comes to the large cities, but in the smaller cities a uniform building program could be adopted. If you would follow this plan under our present set up, Congress could appropriate money for a public building in your city of, say, 75,000 to-day. The law providing for the Government to take over a site by paying the approximate value in the Federal court could be invoked and the site be in the possession of the Government within a week. All that is required is to file a declaration of taking and deposit the money with the court. The plans are available and bids could be advertised for. In 30 days thereafter the bids would be received and the contract awarded. Work could commence at once, in fact, while the site was being cleared these details could be arranged. Why, in my city the Globe Democrat, one of our great newspapers, decided to construct a building long after the appropriation was voted for our

Federal building. That great building is not only completed but occupied, and the Federal building has not been started. The present method must be set aside if we are to help the unemployment situation by the construction of public buildings.

We can save \$3,000,000 by adopting this paragraph and preventing the destruction of the State, War, and Navy Building, and we can save \$700,000 by voting for the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE]. Why should we spend \$760,000 to reconstruct the House Office Building? Sixty thousand dollars will be more than enough to connect the rooms. The other facilities suggested are not necessary merely for the convenience of Members. At this time let us use this money to better advantage. This \$3,700,000 will construct thirty-seven \$100,000 Federal buildings in 37 cities in the country. Spread the money around; do not spend it all in Washington, and you will be helping the unemployed.

As I have stated on this floor on numerous occasions, this city has certainly had its share of public work. Three large buildings in the Mall started within the last month. The total cost will be around \$25,000,000. Then your Supreme Court Building across the Capitol Grounds costing \$10,000,000, contract let, and building operations start February 1. Why, one would think this building program is for the city of Washington alone. The depression has not affected this city, that is, to any extent. Here and there some are suffering, but nothing in comparison to the large cities of the country where the money is collected in taxes to construct these buildings.

I congratulate the new chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BYRNS], who is demonstrating that it is possible to prevent the unnecessary expenditure of public funds. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I was very sorry indeed to hear the gentleman from New York say a few moments ago that he proposed to make a point of order against this paragraph. Frankly, I think some portions of it are subject to a point of order, but I had hoped that on account of the exigencies of the situation, the condition of the Treasury, the very earnest expressed desire of the President, and the very earnest wish of the entire Congress that we balance our budget, that this work could be postponed until some more suitable time.

Some of the speeches that are made here from time to time, some of which I have heard this morning, remind me of the old cry:

Oh, Liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name.

Every time a proposition of this kind comes up gentlemen begin to talk about stonecutters and those who will be benefited if the appropriation is made out of the Public Treasury.

Here is the situation, gentlemen: Regardless of the merits of the proposition from an artistic standpoint—and I confess to you there is no man in this House less qualified to speak on that subject than I am—I do not believe this ought ever to be done. Personally, I think it amounts to an absolute conceit on the part of this generation to feel that it is the last word upon types of architecture. [Applause.] Just as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] said a moment ago, we are going to have a great and beautiful Capital City—in which we all take so much pride—having buildings which will all look alike and when you see one you can take your hat, get on the train or in your motor car, and go home and feel you have seen all of the public buildings of Washington, because they are all being constructed in the same form and in the same manner. I believe that 20 years from now there will be hundreds and thousands of people who will come here—not only citizens of this country but citizens of other countries—who would be glad and who would welcome the opportunity of going down on Pennsylvania Avenue and seeing this great old building. Whatever you may think of it, it represents the type of architecture of the period when it was built, some 40 years ago. I really think it is a great mistake to destroy it. However, outside

of the merits of the proposition, we are in this situation, and I want to appeal to my friend from New York and to my good friend from Nevada: You now propose to take \$3,000,000 of the people's money and use it for the purpose of eliminating space in the State, War, and Navy Building, which is now badly needed.

Take your Radio Commission. I was told a week or two ago that the Radio Commission had made application for space in the new Commerce Building and had been told there was no space which could be given. There is your Radio Commission occupying a great portion of the space on one floor of the National Press Building and doubtless paying thousands of dollars annually for its use.

Now, gentlemen, in the interest of economy, how can we justify ourselves at this time in spending \$3,000,000 in tearing down a part of that old building and eliminating space which is so much needed? I do not think anyone can justify his position in a matter of that sort on the ground that it is going to give somebody a job here in the city of Washington. Why, talk about jobs. There is great need for jobs everywhere, of course, but I want to tell you that here in the city of Washington they are less needed than in any other city or town of the whole United States. [Applause.] We have spent nearly \$50,000,000 in the last few years, and are now spending many millions of dollars in the construction of buildings in this great city. When you talk about the need for jobs, gentlemen, think a little more of the need for jobs back in your own districts and in your own States. [Applause.] Do not get the idea that I am opposed to the city of Washington, that I am not interested in it, or that I am not anxious to see it one of the most beautiful cities in the whole world. Why, a paper yesterday, for which I have great respect and which I read daily, quoted some remarks I made with reference to some property over here back of the Library which had been condemned, for which the Government has to pay \$321,000 more than the \$600,000 which was authorized, and must pay, according to the award of the jury and the court in condemnation proceedings, a sum nearly 128 per cent more than the assessment which has been levied on that property. I said that, assuming that the judgment of the court was correct, the assessment was scandalously low. Of course, I did not mean that in a personal sense. I probably should have used the words "ridiculously low," and it was ridiculously low if the court was correct in its judgment as to its real value. Yet this great paper, for which I have much respect, failed to give the grounds upon which I had made that statement, and I hope that the newspapers of Washington in their reference to the remarks of some of us will in the future explain just why we take the position we take here.

If they did, I feel sure the people of Washington would understand that there is no one in this House, on either side of the aisle, who does not want to see this made a great and beautiful city; but, gentlemen, at the same time, and particularly at this time, we must look to the preservation of the Treasury and the interests of the people back home. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. KETCHAM. In view of the very interesting statement that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has made, I wonder if the gentleman would not direct his thought right now, while we all have the project in mind, to the amount of the appropriation involved here, \$17,000,000; and particularly will he be kind enough to tell us how this is allocated, how much of it is allocated particularly to the District of Columbia for buildings under construction and how much to the country at large?

Mr. BYRNS. There is no allocation of this particular amount so far as the work to be done here in Washington or the work to be done in the country at large is concerned. It is simply an addition which is being made to the amount now on hand to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to continue the work until July 1.

Mr. KETCHAM. That being true, has the gentleman any information from the testimony that was adduced before the committee to indicate how those responsible for the allocation of this money will distribute it, relatively?

Mr. BYRNS. I have no information as to how they will distribute it, because, of course, it will be used in the general fund; but I think I understand just what the gentleman is alluding to and that is whether or not it is going to slow up public building.

Mr. KETCHAM. That is the idea exactly.

Mr. BYRNS. If the gentleman will examine the hearings at page 218, he will find that it was stated by Mr. Martin, one of those who appeared before the committee, that the balance had been reduced as of December 1 to \$55,801,604.19. and I read further from his statement:

We estimate that we will need between \$72,000,000 and \$75,000,000 for the balance of this current fiscal year, which is seven months. Our monthly payment for November was in excess of \$8,000,000 and we expect that the seven months' total will range somewhere between \$72,000,000 and \$75,000,000.

Now, having on hand more than \$55,000,000, the gentleman will very clearly see that \$17,000,000 is ample, under the statement made to the committee, to carry on this work without any possible delay.

In addition to this, I may say to the gentleman that in the meantime the regular annual Treasury bill will have been passed and will doubtless carry an additional sum for public buildings, and this will be immediately available. So there is not the slightest possibility of any let up in the work.

Mr. KETCHAM. I am prompted to ask the question by the statement I saw in the papers, and I do not know, of course, whether it was official or not, that it was not proposed that such an appropriation should come in. Am I correctly or incorrectly advised as to that?

Mr. BYRNS. I am not certain about that, but I think that related not to buildings now under way or buildings where the allocations have heretofore been approved by the Congress. My information is that that alluded to buildings which, it has been indicated by the Treasury, it proposes to erect but which have not yet been sent forward to the House for final approval.

Mr. KETCHAM. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The amount that the gentleman has just referred to in reply to the question submitted by the gentleman is not all being spent in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRNS. Oh, no; I said that that was a part of the general program.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

Mr. Chairman, the paragraph which is to be read now, and concerning which there has been an intimation there will be a point of order made against certain parts of it, is the language and the judgment of the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. BYRNS], backed up unanimously by the entire committee. I do not think I violate any committee confidence in stating that there was not a voice raised against this paragraph. It was the judgment of our chairman, and he has been with this committee a long time, and, in my judgment, there has never been a better or a more distinguished chairman of this great committee, that some kind of word should go to the powers that be that they must not change or demolish these four buildings.

I wish any one of you who has any doubt about the unwisdom of tearing down these fine buildings would go down and make a personal examination of the four buildings mentioned in this paragraph. Who is it in Congress who wants to tear down the big Southern Railway Building, practically

new, and one of the finest buildings in the city, splendidly built, and for which this Government has paid a tremendous sum? Who wants to tear down that fine building in wanton waste of public money? Who wants to tear down the Post Office Department Building? It is one of the old landmarks here. It may look too old to some people or to some architects, but it is one of the attractions here in the city. Who wants to demolish the old State, War, and Navy Building? It is another landmark of distinction.

As well said by our distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. BYRNS], it would be a travesty on economy for us to destroy these fine, substantial buildings in this time of depression. They are four of the big, fine, picturesque buildings of Washington; and forsooth, to make a few jobs for Washington bricklayers and Washington architects, the proposition is to tear them down, waste them, and rebuild.

How many bricklayers and how many carpenters and how many equipment-furnishing concerns and how many architects from your districts back home will get a single penny out of this great waste and unnecessary expense? Not one. Only Washington parasites benefit. Their distinctive, picturesque beauty has jarred the fastidious eye of some overfed, overpumped, overkilted, overindulged, so-called expert, who has no concern about overburdening the people in 48 States with unbearable taxes.

While serving on the District Committee a few years ago a delegation of silk-stockinged highbrows here demanded of us that we remove the tourist park out of Washington. I asked why. They said it was an eyesore. I replied that it could not be seen except from the air. They said, "Oh, whenever we go off on a visit and return on the train over the Southern Railway bridge that is the first thing we see when we cross the Potomac." I asked where they wanted to move it. They said over beyond the Congressional Country Club. I said, why that is way out in the country, miles from the city where no tourists could find it, as many Congressmen get lost in trying to go there. And I told them that our committee was not going to move it, that we had established one of the finest tourist parks in the world here for the benefit of our home constituents, who did not want to be robbed by Washington hotels.

The only argument for tearing down these four fine buildings is that it will make work for Washington laborers. Why, not longer ago than yesterday I was talking to the manager of one of the big department stores in Washington, and he told me that he could not tell that his business this past year had decreased in any substantial amount. He said he could not feel the depression. That is the situation here in Washington. There is no depression in Washington except what comes from the newspaper columns of the depression that exists in the States outside of the District of Columbia. There is a depression everywhere else, but the fat, regular pay roll of the Government of 70,000 employees who get their pay checks twice a month, in most cases, with new money that has never been in circulation, the depression here is averted. Five hundred million dollars has been expended here and goes to the benefit of the laborers and the architects and the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Show me a man who is in favor of tearing down any of these four buildings. There are but three words in the paragraph subject to a point of order. That is "for other appropriations," and, of course, that is subject to a point of order. Why not let that go in. Why does the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] want to strike that out? I hope he will reconsider and not make the point of order to those three words.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Does not the gentleman think that in the matter of remodeling these buildings we can wait?

Mr. BLANTON. Of course we can, and that is the judgment of the greatest chairman that the Committee on Appropriations has ever had, Mr. BYRNS, of Tennessee. We used to follow him years before he became chairman. During his long and valuable service on the Committee on Appropriations we have followed him on both sides of the

aisle on such questions. There is no partisanship in the Committee on Appropriations. I hope there will be no point of order made against this. This limitation in the bill is the only way the committee had to reach the effort of these people who are trying to demolish the four buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. The chairman had to put this in the form of a limitation, for if he had not it would have been knocked out on a point of order. The Committee on Appropriations can not legislate, but it can limit and restrict expenditures of its appropriations, and that is what it is trying to do through these wise limitations put in the bill by our chairman. It is an attempt to say to the powers that be that here in the District of Columbia you shall not spend any part of this \$17,000,000 of the people's money to change or demolish these four buildings that will be useful and stand for a hundred years.

Mr. YON. Would not the gentleman from Texas be sorry to see the Post Office Building demolished?

Mr. BLANTON. Of course I would; it would be an economic blunder and crime if it were done. We have spent millions of dollars to erect these buildings. Now some irresponsible wants to tear them down. We ought to have some buildings of age in the country, some old landmarks to show the Europeans when they come over here. We ought not to let Europe have all the old buildings in the world. [Applause.]

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HOCH. I agree not only as to the Post Office Building but also as to the Municipal Building.

Mr. BLANTON. And how about the new Southern Railroad Building, owned by the Government, which they had hoped to tear down also?

Mr. HOCH. I have not given attention to that. Those two other buildings are modern, and the offices are well arranged, and they are beautiful buildings.

Mr. BLANTON. How about the State, War, and Navy Building? Why, that is the first building in Washington I take my constituents to see, next to the White House. This Congress must give them to understand, clearly and distinctly, that we are not going to permit them to tear these buildings down or to change them.

If the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] sees fit to exercise his privilege of making a point of order against the words "or other appropriations," we will stop them anyway, for the chairman of our committee will then definitely instruct them by having the House strike out the money needed to demolish them.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] will not raise the point of order to this paragraph or to the three words therein that are subject to the point of order. We could save time by his waiving it. There is more than one way of killing a cat; and if we can not succeed in preventing the tearing down of these buildings by reason of the provision in this paragraph, we can do it very effectively by putting the same limitation in every appropriation bill, or it can be done, and I suggest now that it be done so that the Congress may serve notice on the powers that be that they shall not tear down these buildings, by reducing this appropriation so that they can not do it. [Applause.] There is no use of tearing down any of these buildings, especially at this time. I think it is a crime to even think about tearing down the Municipal Building. It is in conformity with the style of architecture that the Fine Arts Commission thinks this whole town should be built under. I think it is a crime to tear down the Post Office Building, which is as good to-day as it was the day that it was built. [Applause.] Perhaps there is some excuse that may be offered for tearing down the Southern Railroad Building, not because it is not a good building, but

it was not built as a Government building, and it has none of the appearance of a Government building. Some excuse may be offered for tearing it down. There is no excuse in the world for altering the State, War, and Navy Building. When I first came to this town I thought that of all the public buildings I looked upon, and that was 30 years ago, it was the prettiest building in the city of Washington. [Applause.] True, I have but little education along art lines, but I think I know a thing of beauty when I look upon it. That building is a building of beauty. Aside from that, even though they want it to conform to the Treasury Building on the one side and the White House in the center, as suggested by the chairman of this committee, we are looking out for space all of the time, and yet we are destroying space and doing a needless and useless thing. We might as well say that in order to give employment to labor we should hire men to haul brick from one side of a yard to the other and then haul them back again and pile them up. There should be some useful purpose in labor and construction. I hope the gentleman from New York will not raise the point of order; but if he does it, I hope the chairman of this committee will offer an amendment to reduce this appropriation so that notice will be served on the gentlemen who have been trying to tear down and alter the State, War, and Navy Building and these other buildings so that they may be made to know that they are to halt in their efforts at destruction. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Sites and construction, public buildings, act of May 25, 1926, as amended: For an additional amount for public buildings, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1932, \$17,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation for the construction of public buildings shall be used for remodeling and reconstructing the Department of State Building under the authorization therefor contained in the act approved July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 907): *Provided further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation shall be used for or in connection with the demolition of the District of Columbia Municipal Building at Fourteenth and E Streets NW., the Post Office Department Building at Twelfth and D Streets NW., or the building, 1300 E Street NW. (formerly the Southern Railway Building).

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order upon the entire paragraph, and I make the point of order on the words "or any other" in line 2, page 25.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bankhead). What is the ground of the point of order?

Mr. LaGuardia. That it is legislation on an appropriation bill; that it refers not to the appropriation in this bill but to an appropriation heretofore made and not referred to or connected with any item in this section or in this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to be heard?

Mr. Byrns. Mr. Chairman, I am frank to say that I think it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. LaGuardia. I make the point of order upon the three words in line 2, page 25, and withdraw it on the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations tacitly confesses the validity of the point of order. A number of precedents on this proposition might be cited, but the Chair does not think it necessary to do so. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LaGuardia. I withdraw the point of order as to the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. Byrns. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Byrns: Page 25, line 1, strike out "\$17,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$16,800,000."

Mr. Byrns. Mr. Chairman, my object in offering this amendment is in line with the remarks made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood]. It has been stated by those representing the Treasury Department that it is expected that \$200,000 will be expended between now and July 1 in connection with the work of remodeling the State, War, and

Navy Building, and that the remainder of the \$3,000,000 would be used in the next fiscal year. I have offered this amendment reducing the sum carried in this appropriation bill by \$200,000, the amount it is said is to be expended, for two reasons: In the first place, if the House adopts the amendment, it will be very clear notice to the authorities that the House does not want this work done at this particular time. In addition to that, I feel sure, after conferring with some of the members of the subcommittee, that the committee will incorporate in the annual Treasury appropriation bill a provision similar to this, of course eliminating the language which has been stricken out under the point of order. I think that serves exactly the same purpose that the committee was trying to serve when it put this provision in.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The adoption of this amendment will not only be notice but under legislative interpretation will be a direction and mandate to them that the Congress of the United States forbids them to do this work.

Mr. BYRNS. It can and should be so construed.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Could the gentleman tell the House how much in these other appropriations would be affected by these three words? Had they already started to use some of this money?

Mr. BYRNS. No. I do not know whether they have prepared any plans or not, but they certainly have not done anything further than that.

Mr. SNELL. Then the gentleman does not think that is really vital?

Mr. BYRNS. They may have some balances on hand, of course, that they could use. That is what we were trying to eliminate by the use of this language which has been stricken out under a point of order.

Mr. SNELL. I think the gentleman has accomplished the same result.

Mr. BYRNS. I think so.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. BURTNESS. Are there any outstanding contracts for materials or anything like that?

Mr. BYRNS. No; there are none so far.

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. LOZIER. It seems to me this amendment and the limitations imposed in the bill are necessary in order to curb the bureaucratic despotism that has grown up in our departments of Government, that contemptuously ignores the will of Congress whenever congressional action runs counter to their selfish and sordid wishes. These departmental buccaners, with the sanction, I am sorry to say, of a previous Congress, seem determined to demolish a large number of public buildings in Washington that cost the American people approximately \$10,000,000 and spend that amount of public funds to build new ones which these self-constituted judges of art consider more ornate and artistic, although the buildings condemned to destruction are among the largest and best preserved structures in Washington and are adequately serving the Government, and are affording more office space than will be available in the proposed new buildings, and which will involve an ultimate expenditure of approximately \$20,000,000.

It is not only vandalism to destroy these magnificent building but inexcusable waste to spend millions of dollars for their replacement at a time when indescribable economic distress exists in every nook and corner of the Nation. I congratulate the chairman [Mr. BYRNS] on his wise judgment in proposing these limitations, and this amendment, which are designed to protect the public Treasury from an indefensible waste of public funds. This amendment will accomplish the desired result and serve notice on these departmental heads that they must not begin the demolition

of these buildings. This is a wholesome provision, and I trust it may be adopted unanimously. Why waste \$10,000,000 in tearing down the present perfectly good buildings and erecting others in their place which will not serve the public needs any better than those which they propose to destroy?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 103, noes 3.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps, \$75.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: Page 36, line 3, after the period, insert the following:

"The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to employ such additional draftsmen, clerks, and inspectors as in his discretion may be necessary to carry on the program of alterations of naval vessels and increases of the Navy efficiently, and to pay said employees out of the funds already appropriated for modernization and increases of the Navy, respectively."

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order that the amendment is not germane and that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill, which is not authorized.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I know this amendment is subject to a point of order. I have five minutes to discuss this question, and there are 1,100 men whose positions depend on the amendment.

This is an amendment that will not cost the Government one extra penny. It does not cost a cent, but it will actually save money. Every day we hear condemnation of the Treasury Department and other departments on account of red tape and not getting work done. That is exactly the situation here. If we undertook to build the Capitol Building and put on half the number of draftsmen needed, you can see the inefficiency and lack of economy in it. That is just exactly what is happening in the modernization of these ships. There are not enough draftsmen to do the work, and the number of draftsmen has been limited by the appropriation. Thirty million dollars of this work came on and the draftsmen were limited to the old schedule, and they are not able to go ahead.

There is contemplated a lay-off in New York of about 600 men; in Philadelphia a lay-off, and in Norfolk a lay-off. I am told by the navy yards that if this work can flow smoothly, if the draftsmen can keep up with the work, they will save between a hundred thousand and two hundred thousand dollars in this modernization.

It is your responsibility as much as it is mine. If you mean what you say, if you want to put men to work, here is a chance to do it. If you want to cut out red tape and inefficiency, here is a chance to do it, and it will not cost a cent of money. I ask each of you not to interpose any objection to this. The chairman of the committee was begging that objections not be interposed to something that the gentleman was interested in. This is only common sense; it is practical, and it will be extremely beneficial. It will keep a thousand men at work who would otherwise be thrown out of employment. It does not cost the Government one additional penny.

Under the appropriation in the Bureaus of Engineering and Construction and Repair, the appropriations are limited to a certain amount. That has all been allocated. This big load of modernization has come on and the present draftsmen are not able to keep that work flowing so that they can bring men in as needed. There are hundreds of men ready to go to work, but the draftsmen can not keep up with them.

In my yard men are working overtime. They do not mind it; but think in this day and time, with people out

of work, of working men overtime in order to keep up with the work, so try to help this work out, and bring other men back. That is the situation. If any Member wishes to go on record as knocking a thousand men out of work by objection to this, that is his privilege; but here is something that will not cost any more.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I yield gladly to the gentleman from Texas, because I expect this gentleman to be with me on this. It does not cost any more money.

Mr. BLANTON. I am for the man who is out of work; but the gentleman admits that unless his amendment is passed a thousand men will go off the pay roll?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. They will go off the pay roll in January and February.

Mr. BLANTON. How many?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Between one thousand and eleven hundred.

Mr. BLANTON. Then we would save the salaries of about 1,000 or 1,100 men if they go off the pay roll?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I am glad the gentleman brought that out. They will not be able to spend the funds already appropriated up to the 1st of July under this modernization unless these men are brought back.

Mr. BLANTON. But when they go off their salaries stop, and it will save that much to the Government.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. But the money is going to be spent eventually, so why not spend it this winter, when it is needed, rather than next summer.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. YON. Does not the gentleman think that the policy that has been carried out in connection with all the public buildings has been the means of making money available without increasing the deficit in the Treasury?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Probably so. Gentlemen, there is one other thought. This very provision is to be recommended in the next naval bill, effective in July, and I have a letter here from Admiral Rock in which he says that because of the situation in which they now find themselves they are going to attempt to correct it in the next naval bill, so as to give them an opportunity to employ these draftsmen. Now, if it is going to be done in July, why not let it become effective right now and help out employment during the present winter?

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The admiral may have another guess coming to him. That is what he is going to propose, but it is a question as to what Congress is going to do.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Would the gentleman from Texas build a house without supplying sufficient architects to prepare the plans and specifications and supervise the work?

Mr. BLANTON. But if I did not need the house I would not build it at all.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. This does not do anything but give the Secretary of the Navy discretion to do this thing. He will not call in these draftsmen unless they are needed; but if they are needed, it gives him the discretion to put them on this work, and in order to carry on the work these draftsmen should be kept on, and it is nothing but ordinary common sense. This is what any good business man would do in meeting a situation of this kind. I have heard the gentleman from Texas criticize the departments because of red tape, so that I thought he would be the first one to help me in this fight. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. BYRNS. Of course, the gentleman knows that, personally, I would like very much to yield to any request he might make of me, but I feel that under the circumstances this amendment ought not to be considered. We have had no hearings on it; we have had no requests from the President, and there has been no request, so far as I know, from the Secretary of the Navy. So it seems to me that under

those circumstances it would be unwise to put it in this bill. Therefore I am constrained to make the point of order.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I have had this up with the Assistant Secretary of the Navy and with Admiral Rock, and I have their letter saying that this will be recommended in the next bill, to be effective in July. They both told me last week that this was needed in order to keep these forces at work.

Mr. BYRNS. I will say this to the gentleman, in response to his statement about the letter: Of course, it may be the opinion of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy that this ought to be done, but when the estimates come forward the subcommittee will consider them, conduct hearings on them, report to the House, and the House will then have an opportunity to have some information about the situation.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Does the gentleman understand that I am not asking for an additional penny, but just to allow these men to be paid out of the modernization funds already appropriated?

Mr. BYRNS. I understand that; but when you use funds already appropriated you are using funds in the Treasury, and thus increasing the deficit. I really do not think we should legislate in that way on an appropriation bill, and, therefore, I am constrained regretfully to make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MOREHEAD). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized by law. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOREHEAD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6660) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MONTAGUE and Mr. LAGUARDIA rose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] desire to submit a motion to recommit the bill. The practice of the House heretofore has been to give to the minority the right to make the motion to recommit when a member of the minority qualifies for that purpose. So the Chair will ask the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Virginia if each of them is opposed to the bill?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am opposed to the bill as it is, and expect to vote against it.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee and as one who is opposed to the bill in its present form, I should like to offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I object to that form of qualification.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] that a member of the

committee who qualifies as being opposed to the bill undoubtedly would have preference in recognition.

Mr. BYRNS. I simply wanted to know if the gentleman is opposed to the bill as it stands.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; I am, and shall vote against it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] qualifies and is entitled to submit a motion to recommit.

The gentleman from Alabama offers a motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama moves to recommit the bill H. R. 6660 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same forthwith back to the House with an amendment striking out the figures "\$760,000" in line 20, page 3, and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "\$60,000," or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'CONNOR and Mr. BLAND) there were—ayes 61, noes 59.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 233, nays 132, answered "present" 1, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—233

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Allgood | Dowell | Johnson, Mo. | Parks |
| Almon | Doxey | Johnson, Okla. | Parsons |
| Andresen | Drane | Johnson, S. Dak. | Patman |
| Andrew, Mass. | Driver | Johnson, Tex. | Patterson |
| Andrews, N. Y. | Evans, Mont. | Johnson, Wash. | Pettengill |
| Arnold | Flesinger | Jones | Polk |
| Bacon | Finley | Karch | Pratt, Harcourt J. |
| Baldrige | Fish | Ketcham | Pratt, Ruth |
| Bankhead | Fishburne | Kinzer | Purnell |
| Barton | Foss | Kniffin | Ragon |
| Beck | Frear | Knutson | Ramseyer |
| Beedy | French | Kopp | Rankin |
| Beers | Fulbright | Kurtz | Rayburn |
| Bland | Fuller | Lambertson | Reilly |
| Blanton | Fulmer | Lambeth | Rich |
| Bowman | Garber | Lamneck | Robinson |
| Brand, Ga. | Gasque | Lanham | Rogers |
| Briggs | Gibson | Lankford, Ga. | Romjue |
| Brumm | Gilbert | Lankford, Va. | Rutherford |
| Buchanan | Gilchrist | Larrabee | Sanders, Tex. |
| Burch | Gillen | Leavitt | Sandlin |
| Burtness | Glover | Lichtenwalner | Schafer |
| Busby | Goodwin | Loofbourow | Schneider |
| Cable | Goss | Lovette | Selvig |
| Canfield | Green | Lozler | Shallenberger |
| Cannon | Greenwood | Luce | Shannon |
| Carden | Gregory | Ludlow | Shott |
| Carter, Wyo. | Griswold | McClintic, Okla. | Shreve |
| Cartwright | Guyer | McGugin | Simmons |
| Cary | Hadley | McKeown | Smith, Idaho |
| Chindblom | Haines | McMillan | Smith, Va. |
| Chilperfield | Hall, Ill. | McSwain | Smith, W. Va. |
| Christopherson | Hall, Miss. | Magrady | Snell |
| Clague | Hall, N. Dak. | Major | Snow |
| Clancy | Hancock, N. C. | Mapes | Sparks |
| Clark, N. C. | Hare | Martin, Mass. | Stafford |
| Clarke, N. Y. | Harlan | May | Steagall |
| Cochran, Mo. | Hart | Michener | Stevenson |
| Cochran, Pa. | Haugen | Millard | Stokes |
| Cole, Iowa | Hill, Ala. | Miller | Strong, Kans. |
| Collier | Hill, Wash. | Milligan | Summers, Wash. |
| Colton | Hoch | Mitchell | Summers, Tex. |
| Connolly | Hogg, Ind. | Montague | Swank |
| Cox | Holaday | Moore, Ky. | Swick |
| Crowe | Hollister | Moore, Ohio | Taber |
| Crowther | Hooper | Morehead | Tarver |
| Darrow | Hope | Mouser | Treadway |
| Davis | Hopkins | Murphy | Tucker |
| DeRouen | Horr | Nelson, Mo. | Turpin |
| Dickinson | Howard | Niedringhaus | Underhill |
| Dies | Huddleston | Nolan | Underwood |
| Dieterich | Hull, Morton D. | Norton, Nebr. | Weeks |
| Disney | Hull, William E. | Oliver, Ala. | West |
| Dominick | Jeffers | Owen | White |
| | Jenkins | Parker, Ga. | Whittington |

Wigglesworth
Williams, Mo.
Williams, Tex.
Williamson

Willson
Wingo
Wolfenden
Wood, Ga.

Woodruff
Woodrum
Wright

Wyant
Yon

NAYS—132

| | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Adkins | Coyle | Hess | Person |
| Allen | Crall | Holmes | Pou |
| Amle | Crosser | Hornor | Prall |
| Arentz | Cullen | Kahn | Rainey |
| Auf der Heide | Curry | Keller | Ramspeck |
| Bachmann | Dallinger | Kelly, Ill. | Ransley |
| Barbour | Davenport | Kelly, Pa. | Read, N. Y. |
| Beam | Delaney | Kennedy | Reid, Ill. |
| Black | De Priest | Kerr | Rudd |
| Bloom | Doughton | Kleberg | Sabath |
| Boehne | Douglas, Ariz. | Kvale | Schuetz |
| Boileau | Douglass, Mass. | LaGuardia | Seger |
| Boland | Drewry | Leach | Sinclair |
| Bolton | Eaton, Colo. | Lehlbach | Sirovich |
| Boylan | Eaton, N. J. | Lewis | Spence |
| Britten | Englebright | Lindsay | Stalker |
| Browning | Eslick | Linthicum | Stewart |
| Brunner | Estep | Loneragan | Sullivan, N. Y. |
| Bulwinkle | Evans, Calif. | McClintock, Ohio | Sutphin |
| Butler | Fitzpatrick | McCormack | Taylor, Colo. |
| Byrns | Gambrill | McFadden | Temple |
| Campbell, Pa. | Garrett | McLaughlin | Thatcher |
| Carley | Gavagan | McReynolds | Tierney |
| Carter, Calif. | Gifford | Maas | Timberlake |
| Chapman | Golder | Mansfield | Vestal |
| Chavez | Goldsborough | Martin, Oreg. | Warren |
| Christgau | Granfield | Norton, N. J. | Wason |
| Cole, Md. | Griffin | O'Connor | Weaver |
| Collins | Hancock, N. Y. | Oliver, N. Y. | Welch, Calif. |
| Condon | Hardy | Palmisano | Wolcott |
| Connery | Hartley | Parker, N. Y. | Wolverton |
| Cooke | Hastings | Peavey | Wood, Ind. |
| Cooper, Tenn. | Hawley | Perkins | Yates |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bacharach

NOT VOTING—67

| | | | |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| Abernethy | Doutrich | Larsen | Strong, Pa. |
| Aldrich | Dyer | Lea | Sullivan, Pa. |
| Ayres | Erk | McDuffie | Swanson |
| Bohn | Fernandez | McLeod | Sweeney |
| Brand, Ohio | Flannagan | Maloney | Swing |
| Buckbee | Free | Manlove | Taylor, Tenn. |
| Burdick | Freeman | Mead | Thomason |
| Campbell, Iowa | Granata | Montet | Thurston |
| Cavichia | Hogg, W. Va. | Nelson, Me. | Tilson |
| Celler | Houston, Del. | Nelson, Wis. | Tinkham |
| Chase | Igoe | Overton | Vinson, Ga. |
| Cooper, Ohio | Jacobsen | Partridge | Vinson, Ky. |
| Corning | James | Pittenger | Watson |
| Crisp | Johnson, Ill. | Quin | Welsh, Pa. |
| Crump | Kading | Sanders, N. Y. | Whitley |
| Culkin | Kemp | Seiberling | Withrow |
| Dickstein | Kendall | Somers, N. Y. | |

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

On the vote:

Mr. McDuffie (for) with Mr. Somers of New York (against).
Mr. Dyer (for) with Mr. Celler (against).
Mr. James (for) with Mr. Corning (against).
Mr. Manlove (for) with Mr. Dickstein (against).
Mr. Thurston (for) with Mr. Mead (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Crisp with Mr. Bacharach.
Mr. Kemp with Mr. Free.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
Mr. Montet with Mr. Buckbee.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Campbell of Iowa.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Freeman.
Mr. Ayres with Mr. Hogg of West Virginia.
Mr. Quin with Mr. Johnson of Illinois.
Mr. Thomason with Mr. McLeod.
Mr. Crump with Mr. Kendall.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Whitley.
Mr. Lea of California with Mr. Swing.
Mr. Overton with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Swanson.
Mr. Vinson of Kentucky with Mr. Pittenger.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Larsen with Mr. Cavichia.
Mr. Jacobson with Mr. Chase.
Mr. Culkin with Mr. Erk.
Mr. Granata with Mr. Welsh of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Bohn with Mr. Tilson.

Mr. BACHARACH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know if the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. CRISP, has voted.

The SPEAKER. He has not.

Mr. BACHARACH. I have a general pair with the gentleman from Georgia, and I wish to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I report back the bill amended in accordance with the instructions in the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion by Mr. BYRNS to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

TAXICABS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 90

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives, unanimously expressed, that Commissioner Patrick, of the Public Utilities Commission, should rescind immediately his order requiring taxicabs in the District of Columbia to be placed upon a meter basis, it being the intention that visitors coming to the Nation's Capital during 1932 shall have taxicab service at the very lowest rate possible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BYRNS, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

THE MORATORIUM

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered over the radio on Sunday afternoon by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Hon. LOUIS T. McFADDEN, in debate with Norman Thomas on the subject of the moratorium, over station WOR Sunday afternoon, December 27, 1931, between 3 and 3.45 o'clock:

As a text for this discussion, I desire to quote from an eminent authority, Calvin Coolidge, who, on October 22, 1930, said:

"Those who are constantly agitating, either for political or publicity purposes, for a revision of German reparations, and who are trying to connect them with the European debts owed the United States, are doing distinct injury to the world economic situation. They arouse new uncertainties and inflame old animosities. We should regard these questions as settled. Let Europe adjust its own difficulties. The present rates of payment can be met by all countries concerned."

"Those saying that if Germany defaults reparations other countries can not pay the United States debts are overreaching themselves. That means that if reparations are not collected from Germany they must be collected from the taxpayers of the United States."

The principles of a republic are those of liberalism, and it fosters the spirit of equal justice among its citizens and of fair dealing with foreign states. Throughout our own history public opinion has manifested its sympathy with the growth of liberal institutions abroad and with foreign causes which appeal primarily to the principle of justice.

In formulating national policy, therefore, when a new question rises in our relation to foreign states public opinion here is not inclined to override the promptings of calm and fair judgment and act hastily in an arbitrary spirit of self-interest. The public judgment at times may be at fault because of insufficient information, but the fault is more likely to arise from this cause than from a deliberate intention to ignore standards of right conduct.

The war in Europe left us a legacy of complicated international questions, and because of their complications there has been much diversity of opinion as to their proper solution. Public opinion has given much attention to them and has been patient and conscientious in its desire to formulate a judgment.

We have heard all that our former allies have had to say about the war debts which they owe us and about the German war reparations. We have been urged as a duty to join the League of Nations and the World Court. Voices from Europe and voices here have urged us as a duty to cancel the allied debts and to forsake the principle of political isolation which they tell us is an ignoble and selfish one.

For some years after the war the situation was so confused that it was impossible for public opinion to reach a judgment. But 13 years have passed now since the war ended, and things

have transpired both here and in Europe that tend to simplify the problem.

We know that when the allied war debts were funded we canceled more than half of the amount of those debts. We know that we took no share in the reparations exacted from Germany, and that there is no logical reason why we should have any concern with them to-day. We know, too, that the German reparations have been a cause of frightful disorganization in Europe ever since the war and that the Allied Governments have persistently sought to make the payment of their debts to us dependent upon the receipt by them of reparations from Germany. We are conscious of a strong determination in Europe to involve us intimately in the interminable controversies which convulse that continent. Just as long as Europe can keep us in these international conferences on war debts, reparations, and all world affairs, just that long has she hopes of involving us in the League of Nations, the World Court, and the world bank—all instruments concocted to take away our freedom in Government and finance.

We know that in the normal prosecution of our domestic and foreign commerce we prospered after the war and that in 1924 the country was in a sound condition financially and industrially. There was nothing in our domestic condition that menaced or threatened this prosperity. But in little more than five years thereafter our financial and industrial structure was shaken to its foundations, chiefly because of the dislocations caused by the enormous loans made to Europe on a scale far beyond Europe's capacity to repay.

We are told that we must postpone or cancel payments on our foreign debt to restore our export trade. In other words, if we give our foreign customers money with which to purchase merchandise, they may buy it from us.

In the 10 years ending with 1929 our total of exports to all countries was \$49,609,677,114. In the same period our total of money sent abroad was over \$60,000,000,000, including foreign loans, investments, debt-funding settlements, gifts, ocean freight bills, travel expenses, and foreign remittances. Exports for the war period were more than covered by our direct war expenditures, which last was also a contribution to foreign interests.

We, ourselves, paid for every dollar of merchandise sold abroad by exporting money which we are now told is never coming back to us. This economic absurdity finally collapsed under its own weight; our alleged "prosperity" ruined us. We can not afford to restore a foreign trade in which we pay for our exports as well as for our imports.

"Hands across the sea" are always palm up when westbound.

We realize now that, far from having followed a policy of isolation, we have to a great extent made Europe's problems our own and in doing so have sacrificed our own interests and imposed unjustified burdens upon our own people. To do more than we have already done would endanger our present safety and jeopardize the Nation's future.

The only good thing about the joint resolution authorizing the Hoover debt moratorium was the amendment which expressed the will of the Congress that there shall be no reduction or cancellation by the United States Government of the debts owed the United States by the foreign countries.

Apart entirely from the international debt question, the method by which the matter was put before the Congress for action sets a dangerous precedent in the negotiation of agreements with foreign governments. If, when Congress is not in session, a President can call in congressional leaders, or even communicate with a majority of the Members of both Houses, telling them that a certain proposed agreement with foreign governments is desirable and urgent, and upon these representations can obtain their promises to ratify it when it is later presented to the Congress in session, the independent power of the Congress under the Constitution is virtually destroyed. I will here and now venture the definite opinion based upon the discussion and expressions of the Members of both Houses of Congress during the consideration last week of the Hoover moratorium that if they had not been pledged last June they would have voted against ratification of the Hoover moratorium.

In the first place, the President is enabled to assure the foreign governments that the Congress will ratify what he does, and this places the Congressmen in an embarrassing position if they subsequently see reasons why ratification should be withheld. The finished product may bear a different aspect from that which it first presented; but, convealing themselves bound by their promises, the legislators may find themselves unable to reconsider their position and, against their better judgment, will vote for ratification.

This is as true with reference to treaties which come only before the United States Senate for ratification, as for agreements affecting revenue, like this one, which must come before both Houses of the Congress.

In this case the information contained in the Executive message asking for ratification was entirely inadequate and misleading. It asked for the ratification of an agreement proposed on June 20 last, for which a certain number of Senators and Representatives had promised approval.

But the agreement of June 20 had, in fact, been materially changed by a subsequent agreement made with France on July 6. Several nations which had immediately ratified the agreement of June 20 had to reconsider their action, and on August 11 they met in London and signed a protocol binding themselves to the terms of the American agreement with France and making Germany a party to it also.

Yet the Executive message on the 10th of December asked for ratification of the moratorium proposed on June 20 and said not a word about the subsequent changes.

The report of the Ways and Means Committee to the House stated that the Franco-American agreement and the London protocol had been before the committee when considering its report. How these documents came before the committee I do not know; they did not accompany the message of the President, and they were never at any time presented to the House itself for its consideration. They together contained the real moratorium agreement, and they ought to have been submitted formally to the Congress.

The whole thing was done in a loose and inadequate manner which showed small regard for the dignity of the Congress and which was a blow to the treaty-making processes of the Constitution.

The general impression, both in and out of Congress, appears to be that Congress has ratified an agreement for the temporary suspension of payments of all war debts and reparations as proposed on June 20 last, the subsequent changes being of only minor importance. This impression is erroneous.

The Franco-American agreement of July 6 excepts the unconditional annuities from the operation of the moratorium; it leaves them in full force, and it rivets them more firmly upon Germany by reason of the agreement of the United States with France that they must be paid. Moreover, when a little later Germany was made a party to this agreement by the London protocol, instead of lessening the amount of the reparations which Germany must pay unconditionally, it increased that amount, because it provided that the conditional annuities suspended for one year are to be funded over a 10-year period and that these payments must then be met unconditionally.

Under the Franco-American agreement the amount that Germany must pay annually without the right of postponement is a larger sum than if the Franco-American agreement had not been made. The moratorium has not lightened the absolute burdens of Germany; it has made them heavier.

If there was any merit at all in the original proposal of June 20, that all payments between governments be temporarily suspended, it would have consisted in holding the critical situation in suspense long enough to give the European governments time to agree upon mutual concessions. But the original proposal was entirely discarded, and under French insistence the absolute obligations of Germany were made harder and more rigid. It can not be said, therefore, that the final agreement has improved conditions in Europe.

It is claimed that the proposal of June 20 prevented a financial collapse in Germany which would have been catastrophic in its influences elsewhere. This was what it was intended to do, but did not accomplish. To accomplish this, immediate ratification by France, as well as by the other nations, would have been necessary.

But it will be recalled France refused to ratify it, and insisted upon the new agreement which I have just described. Instead of the financial conditions in Germany improving they immediately became more critical, and the bankruptcy, which was only threatened on June 20, became actual when later in the summer the great Danat Bank and the banks generally in Germany were thrown into bankruptcy and the Reichsbank had to close its doors. This brought on the financial collapse in England and the fall of the pound, which carried down with it the currencies of numerous of the smaller European countries. If financial catastrophe in Europe has not supervened as a result of the Franco-American agreement, it is hard to understand what financial catastrophe is.

The trouble with Europe to-day is that its international financial structure is grotesquely inflated with a fraudulent asset of \$10,000,000,000 in German reparations with which the allied governments seek to pay all their debts. This asset has no value because it is an asset only if Germany pays punctually the annual interest and sinking fund upon it. Germany has not paid these annual sums out of her own resources. After the war she paid \$9,000,000,000 in reparations which was in fact all that she justly owed. Since then she has not paid reparations out of her own resources, she can not so pay them, and she does not intend to try to do so.

The entire inflated financial structure since the war has been predicated upon the theory that Germany could pay the charges upon billions in reparation bonds held by the allied governments; and there has been an iridescent hope that the American public might be induced to buy these bonds from them. The allied treasuries would thus be filled, and the job of patrolling Germany would be transferred to the United States Government.

It is upon this grandiose financial coup that the allied governments and the international bankers have for years unsuccessfully lavished the intellectual treasures of their minds, and it is because they have made this plan their chief preoccupation that genuine reconstruction in Europe has been at a standstill for 13 years. It is time that this conception be abandoned.

To come back now, in closing, to the amendment which accompanied the passage of the joint resolution by the Congress the other day.

The amendment makes it plain that it is the will of Congress that there shall be no cancellation or reduction of the allied debts to the United States. We believe that these are just debts and that the allied governments are able to pay them out of their own resources and without reference to receipts from German reparations.

Heretofore the allied governments have contrived to get the money from Germany, and there is plenty of indication that they are unwilling to pay us any sums that they do not first collect in this way. One thing is sure, namely, that Germany is going to stop paying reparations, because the American bankers are going to be made to stop lending billions to Germany with which to pay them.

The allied governments will therefore have to make their payments to the United States out of their own resources. The decision whether they will do so is for them alone to make. We can be of no assistance to them in making up their minds. But we will not accept German reparation bonds from them in lieu of what they owe us, nor will we permit them to negotiate them upon the American investment market. In the future, as in the past, it will remain the American position that there is no connection between German reparations and allied debts to the United States.

Mr. Thomas, in answering your presentation I desire to make a constructive suggestion, one that will go further than any other in laying the basis for a justification of real disarmament in the United States, and this suggestion should receive the careful thought and attention of those people in the United States who are so active in agitation looking toward disarmament.

I have pointed out that international bankers and diplomats contend that Europe can not pay the debts it owes to the United States. Our former allies insist that they will pay us only if Germany pays them, and they add that Germany can not pay. According to this contention, American taxpayers are expected to pay Germany's so-called "reparations" to the European nations, which, with our aid, defeated her in the World War.

The allied nations have received substantial material benefit from the war. They have annexed large areas of colonial and other territory which belonged to Germany, Austria, and Turkey. They have persuaded us to cancel the debts incurred for money and material advanced them during the war. The present debts owed us are for money loaned Europe for reconstruction purposes and property sold them at 20 cents on the dollar.

They now claim that world-wide deflation makes the whole or partial cancellation of the postwar debts, amounting to eleven and one-half billion dollars, necessary. The United States is asked to assume the entire burden of this deflation, Europe assuming none. The question of "ability to pay" has been brought to bear on every nation and people involved except the United States and the American taxpayer.

It is only fair that Europe should share in this deflation. It is perfectly practicable for England and France to do this without financial expenditure of any kind; since they are our principal debtors it is fortunate that they are the best equipped to share the burden with us.

England is possessed of numerous island and mainland colonies close to our coasts. No reference to Canada is here intended. Canada is a self-contained Dominion, virtually an independent nation and a most excellent neighbor. Canada is the most virile part of the British Empire to-day and brightest hope for the growth and continuance of British power and influence in the world.

There are other British possessions which do not enjoy the status of Canada. Many of them are the seats of strongly fortified British naval bases and by their location can be designed for no other purpose than possible hostilities against the United States. Bermuda is a case in point. That group of islands has large dockyards and extensive fortifications, barely 30 hours by fast steamer from New York City and hardly 4 hours by airplane. It is only 5 hours by airplane from Hamilton in Bermuda to the Capitol of our Nation at Washington.

The Bahama Islands are not fortified but provide a splendid base for aerial operations against Florida and our south Atlantic seacoast. Jamaica dominates the Caribbean from the center and is an effectual naval and aerial "cover" for the Panama Canal. The Windward and Leeward Islands wall in the Caribbean on the east, British Guiana providing a mainland "anchor" for the long chain of islands which run north to Porto Rico and Haiti. On the western side of the Caribbean, British Honduras occupies a position of great strategic importance.

Trinidad, almost touching the South American Continent, has a strong naval base; so has Kingston, in Jamaica. I would point out that no possible enemy threatens British interest in our home waters, unless Britain regards the United States as an enemy.

May I suggest that it would be a welcome gesture of intended friendship if England should offer to transfer to the United States in part payment of her debt to us the colonial possessions which she holds in waters which wash our coasts from Florida to Maine. It would provide a partial settlement of the debt burden which England finds so heavy, and it would give us a feeling of security, besides strengthening the friendship between the two nations. It would be the most effectual step in the direction of real disarmament which could be taken in the present state of the world. I commend this suggestion to all those groups in the United States who are so active at this time in disarmament—in both our Army and Navy.

I desire to point out that a large part of our national territory in the past has been acquired by purchase. The Louisiana Purchase, the Indian treaties, the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the Gadsden Purchase, the acquisition of Porto Rico and the Philippines, and the comparatively recent purchase of the Danish West Indies, now the Virgin Islands, are cases in point.

It is very likely that the American people would be content to accept a partial settlement of the European debts in territory. Ceding the territory in question would be a convincing evidence that England is willing to bear part of the burden which it now seems she is trying to place upon our unaided shoulders. If this understanding of her intentions is unfair, this proposed territorial suggestion would be a splendid way to prove it.

The territory is extensive. It comprises some 400 islands and the mainland colonies of British Honduras in Central America and British Guiana in South America. The area involved is some 110,000 square miles and the population about 2,300,000.

The possessions of France in American waters are less extensive than those of England, but are important. They begin on the north with St. Pierre and Miquelon and include Martinique, the Guadeloupe Islands, and French Guiana, the latter a mainland colony with some coastal islands. The total area is 33,000 square miles and the population 529,000.

The people of the United States have already proved their willingness to help England and France; it is time for those countries to demonstrate their willingness to recognize our past helpfulness and to relieve the United States of the presence of foreign naval bases in our home waters. We have no territorial ambitions in Europe.

The transfer of the territory in question at fair valuations would also serve to relieve the burden of payment which now rests on British and French taxpayers.

IMPEACHMENT OF ANDREW W. MELLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of constitutional privilege. On my own responsibility as a Member of this House, I impeach Andrew William Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors, and offer the following resolution:

Whereas the said Andrew William Mellon, of Pennsylvania, was nominated Secretary of the Treasury of the United States by the then Chief Executive of the Nation, Warren G. Harding, March 4, 1921; his nomination was confirmed by the Senate of the United States on March 4, 1921; he has held said office since March 4, 1921, without further nominations or confirmations.

Whereas section 243 of title 5 of the Code of Laws of the United States provides:

"Sec. 243. Restrictions upon Secretary of Treasury: No person appointed to the office of Secretary of the Treasury, or Treasurer, or register, shall directly or indirectly be concerned or interested in carrying on the business of trade or commerce, or be owner in whole or in part of any sea vessel, or purchase by himself, or another in trust for him, any public lands or other public property, or be concerned in the purchase or disposal of any public securities of any State, or of the United States, or take or apply to his own use any emolument or gain for negotiating or transacting any business in the Treasury Department other than what shall be allowed by law; and every person who offends against any of the prohibitions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor and forfeit to the United States the penalty of \$3,000, and shall upon conviction be removed from office, and forever thereafter be incapable of holding any office under the United States; and if any other person than a public prosecutor shall give information of any such offense, upon which a prosecution and conviction shall be had, one-half the aforesaid penalty of \$3,000 when recovered shall be for the use of the person giving such information."

Whereas the said Andrew William Mellon has not only been indirectly concerned in carrying on the business of trade and commerce in violation of the above-quoted section of the law but has been directly interested in carrying on the business of trade and commerce in that he is now and has been since taking the oath of office as Secretary of the Treasury of the United States the owner of a substantial interest in the form of voting stock in more than 300 corporations with resources aggregating more than \$3,000,000,000, being some of the largest corporations on earth, and he and his family and close business associates in many instances own a majority of the stock of said corporations and, in some instances, constitute ownership of practically the entire outstanding capital stock; said corporations are engaged in the business of trade and commerce in every State, county, and village in the United States, every country in the world, and upon the Seven Seas; said corporations are extensively engaged in the following businesses: Mining properties, bauxite, magnesium, carbon electrodes, aluminum, sales, railroads, Pullman cars, gas, electric light, street railways, copper, glass, brass, steel, tar, banking, locomotives, water power, steamship, shipbuilding, oil, coke, coal, and many other different industries; said corporations are directly interested in the tariff, in the levying and collections of Federal taxes, and in the shipping of products upon the high seas; many of the products of these corporations are protected by our tariff laws and the Secretary of the Treasury has direct charge of the enforcement of these laws.

MELLON'S OWNERSHIP OF SEA VESSELS AND CONTROL OF UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Whereas the Coast Guard (sec. 1, ch. 1, title 14, of the United States Code) is a part of the military forces of the United States and is operated under the Treasury Department in time of peace;

that the Secretary of the Treasury directs the performance of the Coast Guard (sec. 51, ch. 1, title 14, of the Code of Laws of the United States); that officers of the Coast Guard are deemed officers of the customs (sec. 66, ch. 2, title 14, United States Code), and it is their duty to go on board the vessels which arrive within the United States, or within 4 leagues of the coast thereof, and search and examine the same, and every part thereof, and shall demand, receive, and certify the manifests required to be on board certain vessels, shall affix and put proper fastenings on the hatches and other communications with the hold of any vessel, and shall remain on board such vessels until they arrive at the port of their destination; that the said Andrew William Mellon is now, and has been since becoming Secretary of the Treasury, the owner in whole or in part of many sea vessels operating to and from the United States, and in competition with other steamship lines; that his interest in the sea vessels and his control over the Coast Guard represent a violation of section 243 of title 5 of the Code of Laws of the United States.

CUSTOMS OFFICERS

Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States superintends the collection of the duties on imports (sec. 3, ch. 1, title 19, Code of Laws of the United States); he establishes and promulgates rules and regulations for the appraisement of imported merchandise and the classification and assessment of duties thereon at various ports of entry (sec. 382, ch. 3, title 19, Code of Laws of the United States); that the present Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon, is now and has been since becoming Secretary of the Treasury, personally interested in the importation of goods, wares, articles, and merchandise in substantial quantities and large amounts; that it is repugnant to American principles and a violation of the laws of the United States for such an officer to hold the dual position of serving two masters—himself and the United States.

OWNERSHIP OF SEA VESSELS

Whereas the said Andrew W. Mellon is now, and has been since becoming Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, holding said office in violation of that part of section 243 of title 5 of the Code of Laws of the United States, which provides that "no person appointed to the office of Secretary of the Treasury, * * * shall be the owner in whole or in part of any sea vessel," in that he was and is now the owner in whole or in part of the following sea vessels:

Registered in Norway: *Austvangen, Nordvangen, Sorvangen, Vestvangen.*

Venezuelan flag: 14 tankers, of 36,654 gross tons.

United States flag: *S. Haiti*; 13 general cargo vessels, *Conemaugh, Gulf of Mexico, Gulfbird, Gulfcoast, Gulfgem, Gulfking, Gulfknight, Gulfknight, Gulfpoint, Gulfprince, Gulfstar, Gulfstream, Gulfwar, Harmony, Ligonier, Ohio, Susquehanna, Winifred, Currier, Gulf of Venezuela, Gulfbreeze, Gulfcrest, Gulfhawk, Gulfland, Gulfmaid, Gulfpenn, Gulfpride, Gulfqueen, Gulfstate, Gulftrade, Gulfwing, Juniata, Monongahela, Supreme, Trinidadian.*

INCOME TAXES PAID BY MELLON COMPANIES AND REFUNDS MADE TO THEM—BY HIMSELF

Whereas section 1 (2), chapter 1, title 26, of the Code of Laws of the United States, provides "The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall have general superintendence of the assessment and collection of all duties and taxes imposed by any law providing internal revenue * * *." The tax laws of the United States, including the granting of refunds, credits, and abatements, are administered in secret under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury; that income-tax returns and evidence upon which refunds are made, or granted, to taxpayers are not subject to public inspection; that under the direction of the present Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon, many hundred corporations that are substantially owned by him annually make settlement for their taxes and many such corporations have been granted under his direction large tax refunds amounting to tens of millions of dollars.

OWNERSHIP OF BANK STOCK

Whereas section 244, chapter 3, title 12, of the Code of Laws of the United States, provides:

"SEC. 244. Chairman of the board; qualifications of members; vacancies.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall be ex officio chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. No member of the Federal Reserve Board shall be an officer or director of any bank, banking institution, trust company, or Federal reserve bank, nor hold stock in any bank, banking institution, or trust company; * * *." That the present Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon, is now and has been since becoming Secretary of the Treasury the owner of stock in a bank, banking institution, and trust company in violation of this law.

WHISKY BUSINESS

Whereas the said Andrew W. Mellon has held the office of Secretary of the Treasury in violation of section 243 of title 5 of the Code of Laws of the United States, in that from March 4, 1921, to October 2, 1928, he was interested in and received his share of the proceeds and profits from the sale of distilled whisky, which said whisky was sold as a commodity in trade and commerce.

ALUMINUM IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Whereas the said Andrew W. Mellon has further violated the law which prohibits the Secretary of the Treasury from being

directly or indirectly interested or concerned in the carrying on of business or trade or commerce, in that as Secretary of the Treasury he controls the construction and maintenance of public buildings; the Office of the Supervising Architect is subject to the direction and approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; the duties performed by the Supervising Architect embrace the following: Preparation of drawings, estimates, specifications, etc., for and the superintendence of the work of constructing, rebuilding, extending, or repairing public buildings; under the supervision of the Supervising Architect and subject to the direction and approval of the Secretary of the Treasury the Government of the United States has spent and will soon spend several hundred million dollars in the construction of public buildings. The said Andrew W. Mellon is the principal owner and controls the Aluminum Co. of America, which produces and markets practically all of the aluminum in the United States used for all purposes. The said Andrew W. Mellon has, while occupying the position as Secretary of the Treasury, directly interested himself in the carrying on and promotion of the business of the Aluminum Co. of America by causing to be published in Room 410 of the Treasury Building of the United States, located between the United States Capitol and the White House, a magazine known as the Federal Architect, published quarterly, which carries the pictures of public buildings in which aluminum is used in their construction and carries articles concerning the use of aluminum in architecture which suggest how aluminum can be used for different purposes in the construction of public buildings for the purpose of convincing the architects who draw the plans and specifications for public buildings that aluminum can and should be used for certain construction work and ornamental purposes. The use of aluminum in the construction of public buildings displaces materials which can be purchased on competitive bids, whereas the Aluminum Co. of America holds a monopoly and has no competitors. Said magazine is published by employees of the United States Government in the Office of the Supervising Architect and distributed to the architects of the Nation, many of whom have been or will be employed by the Supervising Architect to draw plans and specifications for public buildings in their local communities. More aluminum is now being used in the construction of public buildings, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, than has ever before been used, as a result of this advantage.

MELLON INTEREST IN SOVIET UNION (RUSSIA)

Whereas section 140 of title 19 of the Code of Laws of the United States provides:

"SEC. 140. Goods manufactured by convict labor prohibited.—All goods, wares, articles, and merchandise manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is prohibited, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of this provision."

charges are now being made that goods, wares, articles, and merchandise are being transported to the United States from the Soviet Union (Russia) in violation of this act; the present Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon, whose duty it is to enforce this provision of the law, is one of the principal owners of the Koppers Co., a company with resources amounting to \$143,379,352, which is carrying on trade and commerce in all parts of the world; that said company during the year 1930 made a contract with the Soviet Union whereby the Koppers Co. obligated itself to build coke ovens and steel mills in the Soviet Union aggregating in value \$200,000,000, in furtherance of the Soviet's 5-year plan; that said contract is now being carried into effect, and the said Andrew W. Mellon is financially interested in its success; that his interest in this contract with the Soviet Union destroys his impartiality as an officer of the United States to enforce the above-quoted law; his interest in said company, which is engaged in the business of carrying on trade and commerce, disqualifies him as Secretary of the Treasury under section 243 of title 5 of the Code of Laws of the United States and makes him guilty of a high misdemeanor and subject to impeachment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized and directed, as a whole or by subcommittee, to investigate the official conduct of Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, to determine whether, in its opinion, he has been guilty of any high crime or misdemeanor which, in the contemplation of the Constitution, requires the interposition of the constitutional powers of the House. Such committee shall report its findings to the House together with such resolution of impeachment or other recommendation as it deems proper.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures not exceeding \$5,000, as it deems necessary.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the articles just read be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and upon that motion I demand the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, that the articles be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL SHIPS

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the Naval Affairs Committee has before it a program that calls for an expenditure of more than \$616,000,000 to be used in the construction of additional ships. I have always taken the position that our Navy should be given all of the support that is necessary to protect our citizens, and when it is taken into consideration that with an adequate air force no nation on earth could land an army on our shores, I can not conscientiously support any such program when all of this money is to be expended for a class of ships that are not needed at the present time. I felt warranted in presenting the following statement to the Naval Affairs Committee:

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday Secretary Adams, testifying before this committee, made the statement that the President of the United States had not been consulted with respect to the proposed naval building program bill amounting to more than \$616,000,000. President Hoover is the Commander in Chief of all of our military forces. If he has not been consulted in regard to the military program, then, as I view it, it is the duty of all subordinates to acquaint him with any policy they desire to see put into effect. If Secretary Adams has not done this, then I can not see how he can appear before this committee and act in good faith to the President. If Secretary Adams is not in accord with the President's views on matters of vital interest to the Nation and the world, then, following the precedents established by William Jennings Bryan and others while serving in the Cabinet, he should tender his resignation.

Yesterday I offered a motion that the bill be sent to the Navy Department for a report, having in mind that this action, if taken, would cause the committee to have before it officially the views of the department, thus enabling the Secretary of the Navy to proceed in a proper way, thereby giving the views of the administration. The motion was defeated, as only Congressman EVANS, of California, and Congressman BOLAND, of Pennsylvania, voted with me for the motion.

Many of the best minds in the Nation are of the opinion that it would not be possible for any nation on earth to land an army on our shores as long as we maintain adequate aircraft. If this is true, then the expenditure of \$700,000,000 could not possibly be of any service to the Nation unless we were contemplating some kind of offensive military move. The country at the present time is facing its greatest depression. There are over 6,000,000 out of employment. There have been over 10,000 banks crashed within the last few years. The Government is facing a deficit that is estimated at \$2,000,000,000. Imports and exports have fallen off several million dollars. The staple products of the country, such as corn and wheat, are selling below the cost of production. The people of the United States, in my opinion, will not countenance the expenditure of such a sum of money for military purposes, unless the necessity is apparent, and I can not conscientiously support such a program.

The President of the United States has already appointed delegates to meet with the representatives of the other military powers for the purpose of reducing expenditures. The countries that have been benefited by the moratorium expended last year nearly \$2,000,000,000 for armaments. The wild struggle for military supremacy on the part of various nations is the principal cause for the depression in Europe, and unless new agreements can be put into effect and those charged with the responsibility of representing our people will assume a peaceful and friendly attitude, untold miseries and hardships will be the result. As I view it, the Naval Affairs Committee should give the delegates appointed by the President the right to proceed in a friendly manner without following the dictation of certain officials in the Navy who will gladly spend all of the money there is in this Nation for the purpose of constructing a few additional ships, many of which are now in the obsolescent type.

The Democratic majority leader, Congressman Henry T. RAINEY, has been quoted by the press as being against this program. Congressman Joseph W. BYRNS, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has offered a bill to consolidate all of the military activities under one head, having in mind that expenditures must be reduced. I desire to congratulate him for making this proposal, as such a policy would do away with duplication, extravagance, and waste to the extent millions of dollars could be saved and at the same time more efficiency could be brought about.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to—
Mr. SOMERS of New York, for an indefinite period, on account of the death of his father.

Mr. THOMASON, on account of illness.

Mr. THURSTON, on account of serious illness in his family.

Mr. CHASE, on account of death in his family.

Mr. BOHN, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNS. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, to meet to-morrow, Thursday, January 7, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

351. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of Weymouth Fore River, Mass., from Hingham Bay to the Weymouth Fore River Bridge (H. Doc. No. 207); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

352. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of Kodiak Harbor, Alaska (H. Doc. No. 208); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

353. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of Youngs Bay and Youngs River, Oreg. (H. Doc. No. 209); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

354. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of Stikine River, Alaska (H. Doc. No. 210); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

355. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of East Waterway, Seattle Harbor, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 211); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

356. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination of Fox River, Wis., with a view to the control of its floods (H. Doc. No. 212); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

357. A letter from the president of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting annual report of that company for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1931; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LOOFBOUROW: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 6663. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Skull Valley Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4145. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. LaForge; without amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4150. A bill authorizing issuance of patents in fee to Benjamin Spottedhorse and Horse Spottedhorse for certain lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1282) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Fry; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 565) granting a pension to Ada May Fuller; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 707) granting a pension to Ella I. Dewire; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1052) granting a pension to Hiram P. Marcum; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 7108) to provide that no interest shall be charged veterans on loans made on adjusted-service certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 7109) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, by providing allowances for widows and children and dependent parents of veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BOLAND: A bill (H. R. 7110) imposing a tax on motor busses and motor trucks operating in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 7111) to amend the act of April 9, 1924, so as to provide safer access to national parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 7112) to provide for terms of the United States District Court for the Western Judicial District of Oklahoma to be held at Shawnee, Okla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLOVER: A bill (H. R. 7113) authorizing the erection of a marker suitably marking the site of the Battle of Arkansas Post; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 7114) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, by providing allowances for widows and children and dependent parents of veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7115) authorizing appropriations for the construction and maintenance of improvements necessary for protection of the national forests from fire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 7116) to amend section 15a of the interstate commerce act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7117) to amend section 15a of the interstate commerce act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 7118) to protect trademarks used in commerce, to authorize the registration of such trade-marks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 7119) to authorize the modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 7120) to provide for the construction of post-office buildings to relieve unemployment and economic depression, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H. R. 7121) to repeal obsolete statutes and improve the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 7122) to provide for the confirmation of a selection of certain lands by the State of Arizona for the benefit of the University of Arizona; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H. R. 7123) to provide for the manufacture and sale of industrial and beverage alcohol for

lawful purposes in Osage County, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution (H. Res. 91) to provide for an investigation of general labor conditions throughout the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN: Resolution (H. Res. 92) relative to impeachment of Andrew William Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 180) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 181) authorizing an appropriation for the expenses of the sixteenth session of the International Geological Congress to be held in the United States in 1933; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 182) authorizing an appropriation to defray the expenses of participation by the United States Government in the second polar year program, August 1, 1932–August 31, 1933; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 7124) granting an increase of pension to Maria Stackhouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 7125) to provide for an examination and survey of the channel of Little Wicomico River, Northumberland County, Va., and of the channel connecting the said river with the Chesapeake Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7126) to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the channel in Jacksons Creek, Middlesex County, Va., and the channel connecting with the channel in the Plankatank River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7127) to provide for an examination and survey of the waters and channels between the Chesapeake Bay and Chincoteague Bay in the State of Virginia, lying between the mainland and the islands along the coast with a view to providing an inland waterway from the Chesapeake Bay to Chincoteague Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BOLTON: A bill (H. R. 7128) for the relief of Della O'Brien; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 7129) granting a pension to Lillie J. Goens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7130) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Risk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COYLE: A bill (H. R. 7131) for the relief of Theodore Lyons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 7132) for the relief of Fred West; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7133) granting a pension to Cora B. Noyes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 7134) for the relief of Julia Santiago; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 7135) granting a pension to John Swindle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7136) for the relief of Moses F. Birdwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H. R. 7137) granting a pension to the regularly commissioned United States deputy marshals of the United States court in the Indian Territory or the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, including the Indian Territory, now the State of Oklahoma, and to their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 7138) to provide for a survey in Old Tampa Bay, Fla., from the vicinity of Port Tampa, to Bay View, in the same bay, with a view to securing a channel of approximately 14 feet depth and 100 feet wide, together with the necessary turning basin; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7139) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Blair; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 7140) for the relief of Royal W. Robertson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 7141) granting an increase of pension to Ada A. Bevers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 7142) for the relief of the heirs of C. K. Bowen, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 7143) granting a pension to Emma Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H. R. 7144) granting a pension to Anna Weatherby Gibbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7145) granting a pension to Walter M. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7146) granting a pension to Mayme Gienandt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 7147) granting a pension to Robert F. Tool; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7148) granting an increase of pension to Mabel C. B. Frazier; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7149) granting a pension to Dora E. Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 7150) for the relief of Adelaide A. Whiteman and her husband, William F. Whiteman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7151) for the relief of Fred Floyd Ferguson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 7152) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Stiles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7153) granting an increase of pension to Jane Rightenour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7154) for the relief of R. Q. Merrick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7155) for the relief of George Henry Kelly; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 7156) granting a pension to Eleanora Emma Bliss; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLARD: A bill (H. R. 7157) for the relief of Hyman E. Shulman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7158) granting an increase of pension to Miranda C. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 7159) for the relief of Stanwaity Killcrease; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7160) for the relief of Spencer Talkington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7161) for the relief of Clarence P. Adams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7162) granting a pension to Taylor Pinkston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7163) granting a pension to Larkin P. Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7164) granting a pension to Margaret A. Moomaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7165) granting a pension to John B. Vaughan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERSON: A bill (H. R. 7166) granting a pension to Ella M. Lawhead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOTT: A bill (H. R. 7167) for the relief of Stuart L. Ritz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7168) for the relief of James R. Hess; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 7169) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Pickett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMASON: A bill (H. R. 7170) granting an increase of pension to John P. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 7171) granting a pension to Margaret Thurman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 7172) granting an increase of pension to Katherine M. De Witt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 7173) granting a pension to Joseph J. Carroll; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7174) for the relief of James J. Meaney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7175) for the relief of Abe Rubenstein; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7176) granting a pension to Esther Simpson Bingham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7177) granting a pension to Caroline Surrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7178) granting a pension to Nellie F. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7179) granting a pension to Annie Rhodes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON: A bill (H. R. 7180) granting an increase of pension to Kizy A. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YON: A bill (H. R. 7181) for the relief of Homer V. Milton; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

271. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution adopted at a meeting of the Association of General Chairmen, Standard Railroad Organizations, in New York City, opposing all forms of transportation competing with the railroads under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

272. Also, letter from the president of the Eppinger & Russell Co., of New York, N. Y., in re tax revision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

273. Also, letter from Whitehead Bros. Co., New York, N. Y., opposing the proposed tax on automobiles and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

274. Also, telegram from A. R. Gribben, president of the Auburn Sales Co. (Inc.), New York, N. Y., opposing tax on automobiles and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

275. Also, letter from the president of the Simons, Stewart Co. (Inc.), New York, N. Y., opposing tax on automobiles and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

276. By Mr. CLANCY: Petition of Emil Schwartz and John Petz and approximately 1,300 other residents of Detroit, for legislation curbing the chain-store system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

277. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of California State Association of Journeymen Barbers, that Congress take whatever action seems necessary to create in these United States a state of temperance in the use of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

278. By Mr. DE PRIEST: Petition of Operative Plasterers and Cement Finishers' Industrial Association of the United States and Canada, Local No. 93, New Orleans, La., affiliated with the American Federation of Labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

279. By Mr. EATON of Colorado: Petition of the Larimer County Stockgrowers Association, opposing any further extension to the Rocky Mountain National Park in particular

or any other national park in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

280. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of California Farmers' Convention, Sacramento, Calif., December 2, 3, and 14, 1931, re National Farm Board; duty on importation on pineapples and bananas from all foreign countries; financing of foreign countries and competition of the Philippines and Cuba, causing wreckage of American farming; continuance of Federal Farm Board, adequate tariff the foundation of farm relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

281. Also, petition of George A. Marshall Camp, No. 89, Department of California, United Spanish War Veterans, to amend the act of Congress approved March 26, 1928; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

282. Also, petition of board of supervisors, city and county of San Francisco, Calif., to amend the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

283. Also, petition of Shasta County Pomona Grante, through its secretary, Mrs. Gertrude A. Steger, for forest-fire control and preservation of the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

284. Also, petition of Los Angeles section, American Society of Civil Engineers, for sufficient appropriations for mapping purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

285. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Ladies' Auxiliary 37 to Branch 36, National Association of Letter Carriers, opposing the passage of H. R. 4711 and 5467 reducing the salaries of Federal employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

286. By Mr. HERR: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Tacoma, urging the construction of naval vessels under the London agreement of 1930 to the maximum set by that treaty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

287. By Mr. KURTZ: Resolution from Pennsylvania Woman's Christian Temperance Union, opposing resubmission of national prohibition to the States by a resolution to submit an appeal amendment either to State conventions or to State legislatures for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

288. By Mr. PERSON: Resolution of city commission of the city of Royal Oak, Mich., favoring legislation which provides for the creation of a sinking fund to refinance legally constituted drainage districts; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

289. Also, petition of citizens of Detroit, Mich., and vicinity, to enact legislation to curb the activities of the chain-store system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

290. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Resolutions of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, San Antonio Chapter, No. 14, relative to veterans' legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

291. Also, resolution of Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Heart of Texas Chapter, No. 19, Temple, Tex., relative to veterans' legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

292. By Mr. SNOW: Petition of Joseph Gagnon and many other citizens of Eagle Lake, Aroostook County, Me., urging that duty be placed on forest products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1932

The Chaplain, Rev. Zebarny T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who abidest with us in the darkness even as in the light, leading us the while, hold captive every waiting thought as we contemplate anew the mystery of Thy indwelling; By our awareness of Thy presence quicken the sense of obligation involved in our relationship to Thee, our country, and our fellow men, that from the dark-woven flow of change the mask of transience may be lifted, revealing to the light our own immortal destiny. Bring Honour back to earth as king once more, cause Nobleness to walk our